Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-091
Wednesday
11 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-091 *11 May 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

CTK Interviews Gerasimov on INF Treaty *[Prague CTK]* 1
NATO High-Tech Weaponry Trends Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 May]* 1

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Shultz Geneva Meeting Under Way 3
Shevardnadze Arrives 3
Shevardnadze Makes Statement 3
Shultz Arrives in Geneva 3
Ministerial Talks Begin 3
Prospects for Talks Considered *[Solton]* 3
Further on Senate Postponement of INF Debate 4
More on Postponement *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* 4
Reagan, Republicans Discuss INF 5
U.S. Vetoes UN Security Council Resolution 5
Reagan 'Contradictory' on Iran-Contra Pardons 5
Carlucci Cited on Allies' Military Expenditure *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 May]* 6
Policy Experts Present Joint Study on Relations *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 6
Visit to WASHINGTON POST Described *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 7

China

Commentary Praises Stand on Nuclear Testing 8
Economist Eyes 'Breakthroughs' in Reform *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 8
12th Communist Youth League Congress Ends *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 May]* 10

Northeast Asia

Soviet Far East 'Special Economic Zone' *[Tokyo KYODO]* 11
Japanese Socialist Delegation Visits Moscow 11
Okuno's Resignation Demanded *[Tokyo KYODO]* 11
Received by Kamentsev 12
Japanese Parliamentarian Itoyama Departs 12
Talks on Japanese Salmon Catch Quota Ends *[IZVESTIYA 3 May]* 12
Golts Assails ROK General's Visit to Japan *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 May]* 12
DPRK Foreign Minister Makes Moscow Stopover *[IZVESTIYA 10 May]* 13
Envoy to Mongolia Replaced, Reassigned *[PRAVDA 3 May]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Thailand's Prem Tinsulanon on Upcoming Visit 13
Maltreatment of Vietnamese Workers Reported
[Zisman in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 May] 14
Ship Repair Facility in Philippines Suggested *[Manila PNA]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Armed Forces Deputy Chief on Afghan Withdrawal 16
No 'Deviation' Planned 16
Rebels Plan To Attack *[AFP]* 17

Paper Honors Reporter Killed in Afghan Ambush *[IZVESTIYA 6 May]* 17
Worshippers Condole Slain Kabul Citizens 17
Pakistan Sending Arms to Sri Lankan Muslims *[(Bativ)]* 18
Western Presence in Gulf Heightens Tension 18
Soviet Proposals Supported *[Persiyanov in TRUD 7 May]* 18
'Militarists' Send Chemical Arms 19
Social Factors in Islamic Revival Analyzed *[Sedov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 May]* 20
New Israeli 'Aggressive Actions' Analyzed *[Geyvandov in IZVESTIYA 9 May]* 22

Sub-Saharan Africa

London Talks on Southern Africa Summarized *[Ryasova]* 23

East Europe

Gdansk Shipyard 'Illegal Demonstration' Ends 24
Emergency Powers Discussed 24
Western Forces 'Manipulating' Polish Strikes *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* 24
PZPR Politburo Examines Bilateral Relations 25
Further on Gromyko Delegation's Romania Visit 26
Moscow Departure Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* 26
Ceremony Greets Delegation 26
Talks With Ceausescu 27
Presents Order to Ceausescu *[PRAVDA 11 May]* 27
Yazov Greets CSSR Defense Minister on Jubilee *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 May]* 28
CPCZ Conferences Support Restructuring *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 29

West Europe

FRG Socialist Leader Vogel Visits USSR 29
Met by Dobrynin, Others 29
Talks With Gorbachev 29
Reform Situation 'Serious' *[DPA]* 30
Kohl Aide on Upcoming Summits With Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 30
Danish Election Issues, Progress Examined 30
Solovyev Commentary 30
Focus on Foreign Policy Issues 31
Opinion Polls 'Contradictory' 31
Denmark Nuclear Issue Leads to Greenland Crisis 32
Fishing Negotiations Held in Stockholm 32
Security, Cooperation Talks Held With Swiss 32
More on Reelection of France's Mitterrand 33
PRAVDA To Be Published in Austria 33
Tolkunov Receives Europarliamentarians 33
International Press Institute Meets in Turkey 33

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Leaders 'Instruct' Contras To Wreck Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 May]* 34
Commentary on Anniversary of Ties With Cuba 34
Dobrynin, Cuban Communist Party's Risquet Meet 35
Maslyukov Receives Cuban Minister Portal 35
Mokanu Comments on Results of Caribbean Tour *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Meets With Media Officials *[PRAVDA 11 May]* 36
Role of Previous Party Conferences Examined *[Kosarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 May]* 48
Trial of Sumgait Rioters Opens 11 May 51
Correspondent's Preview *[TRUD 11 May]* 51
80 People Charged 52
Comment on Trial *[Kadymbekov, Chernenko in PRAVDA 11 May]* 52

Dissidents To Request New Party 'Registration' *[AFP]* 51
'Democratic Union' Seen as 'Provocation' 53
Ukrainian Party Censures Rovno Authorities *[Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA 4 May]* 54
Chernobyl Victims' Treatment Data Revealed *[IZVESTIYA 6 May]* 55
Lithuanian Nuclear Station Said 'Sinking' *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 26 Apr]* 56
Weekly Prints Letters on Delicate Themes *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 4 May]* 57
KOMMUNIST Issue on Restructuring Described 60

Economic

Stalinist Theories, Resultant Problems Examined *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 61

Agricultural

Farmers Plan To Boost Protein-Rich Crops *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 65
Further April Spring Sowing Data Noted *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 66

Military

Victory Day Brings Officials' Memories, Thoughts 66
Kurkotkin Interview *[IZVESTIYA 9 May]* 66
Tretyak on Losses, Gains 69
Shestapolov on War Anniversary, New Proposals 71
Zaykov, Yazov Honor Unknown Soldier 71
Sukhorukov on World War II, GDR Role Today 71
Volkogonov on 'Truth' in Historical Analysis *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 72
Memorial Plaque Commemorates Army Gen Yepishev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 May]* 73

CTK Interviews Gerasimov on INF Treaty

LD1005183188 Prague CTK in English
1517 GMT 10 May 88

[By Jan Stejskal]

[Text] Moscow May 10 (CTK correspondent)—The Soviet Union does not expect the ratification process of the treaty to scrap medium- and shorter-range missiles to be slowed down by the U.S. Senate's decision to postpone its debate on the issue, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said in an interview with CTK here today.

Senate officials said that the text of the treaty needed clarification of some questions of verification before the document is ratified. The debate was due to start tomorrow and has been postponed indefinitely.

Gennadiy Gerasimov voiced hope that the treaty would be ratified before President Reagan comes to Moscow (on May 29) although the debate was postponed.

NATO Hi-Tech Weaponry Trends Viewed

PM1105092588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel V. Alekseyev: "The Pentagon's 'Strategies of Rivalry'"]

[Text] The purpose of the "strategies of rivalry" which are being elaborated by a special group at the U.S. Defense Department consists in making maximum use of the West's technological superiority in individual spheres of science and technology to create highly effective weapons systems. It is above all a question of the strengthening of the potential of one of the components of "NATO's triad"—the general purpose forces.

People in the Pentagon believe that favorable conditions exist now for translating the technological opportunities of the United States and its allies into reality, opportunities for production sharing in the sphere of the use of their collective industrial potential within the framework of the so-called "balanced technological initiative"—a program, that is, of the elaboration of progressive technologies for the creation of conventional weapons systems and military hardware which would meet the long-term interests of the allies. This program was set out in detail in a report submitted by the Pentagon to the U.S. Congress in May 1987. It is planned to appropriate more than 1.5 billion dollars for its implementation in the upcoming 5-year period.

At the same time, the United States has set itself the task to engage the Soviet Union in competition and to force it to embark on the development of weapons systems which will ultimately prove ineffective from the viewpoint of the effort, money, and time that went into them.

The joint development [razrabotka] of "lethal technologies" under the "strategies of rivalry" plan is aimed at acquiring and introducing in the allied countries' forces precision-guided, long-range reconnaissance and strike complexes—the material basis for the implementation of the "Follow-on Forces Attack" concept in the operations of the NATO Allied Forces in the European theater of military operations. The concept which makes provision for a "substantial strengthening of the bloc's forward defense" is allegedly based solely on the use of nonnuclear (conventional) means of armed struggle. Consequently, the NATO military leadership believes, it calls for the enhancement of the potential of the means of engaging the enemy over long distances with the aim of limiting the scale of enemy troop movements to the front line and reliably isolating the area of combat operations. U.S. and NATO strategists see the practical embodiment of the concept of "Follow-on Forces Attack" in air-land operations in the massive application of integrated systems (complexes) of high-precision means of detection, control, communication, and processing of data, and delivery of munitions to selected targets.

Within the framework of the "strategies of rivalry," the United States and its NATO allies are planning to improve the following combat systems and means on the basis of new technologies.

In the Air Force it is the modernized B-52G strategic bomber which is capable of disabling targets by means of missile and bombing strikes without entering the enemy's air defense zone; the F-111 long-range fighter-bomber which is intended for deep strikes against especially important targets; the dual purpose F-15E tactical fighter-bomber which ensures the isolation of the battle field; and the universal F-16 aircraft intended for attacks on enemy follow-on forces (reserves).

It is envisaged to use standardized cluster bomb units containing precision-targeting "Skeet"-type munitions, concrete-piercing and combined-action aerial bombs, and guided aerial bombs with laser, infra-red, and television guidance systems as weapons for these delivery vehicles. Attaching special importance to the means of electronic warfare, the United States has proposed to a number of NATO countries the development of an operational-tactical anti-radar missile "Tacit Rainbow" to be launched from an aircraft platform. Conceptually, this missile is to be capable of patroling the enemy air defense zone for a relatively long time and disabling enemy radar stations as they come into operation. Thanks to its characteristics of high selectivity and precision, "Tacit Rainbow" is to find wide application above all in conditions of the Central European theater of military operations, according to Western military experts.

Four NATO countries have jointly developed an MLRS multiple launch rocket system for unguided and correctable trajectory ballistic missiles. It is planned to adapt it for launching the short-range "ATACM" missile which

is to replace the "Lance" missile in its conventional warhead version. The United States, Canada, France, the FRG, and a number of other NATO countries are taking part in the creation of a high-precision homing munition for large-caliber artillery to be used against armored targets.

As is known, NATO is planning to use in operations against second echelon (reserve) enemy forces warships equipped with SLCM's which are put at the disposal of the U.S. Armed Forces commander in chief, Europe [title as published]. In connection with this, work is currently under way under the "strategies of rivalry" plan to create an SLCM "Tomahawk" missile with a conventional warhead. It will have a longer range and enhanced accuracy of aim in respect of stationary targets deep in the rear of Warsaw Pact countries.

The United States and NATO are paying much attention to fast-action, reliable, high-precision systems of detection, control, communication, and processing of data which ensure the effective application of delivery vehicles and destruction of enemy targets. The list of future developments under the "strategies of rivalry" includes a high resolution radar reconnaissance system for the TR-1 aircraft, a comprehensive ground forces reconnaissance system designed for installation on the RC-12K aircraft, and the remotely piloted reconnaissance and electronic warfare vehicle IEW-UAV. Multipurpose joint ground forces and air force programs include the "JSTARS" radar system for reconnaissance and targeting of ground-based targets, the "JTIDS" [Joint Tactical Information Distribution System] integrated communication and data distribution system, and a number of systems for data processing and display.

Common sense points the way forward toward a radical lowering of the level military confrontation and toward stable security based on political agreements. The old way of thinking is pulling backwards toward a perpetuation of the situation where stable danger is viewed as a guarantee of security. Trying to intimidate the public of their countries with the imaginary "decisive superiority" of the Warsaw Pact in nuclear, chemical, and conventional arms and with "gaps" in the NATO defenses resulting from the elimination of the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles, certain circles in the West are trying in every way to arrest the process of rolling back the arms race.

Hence the emergence of the "strategies of rivalry," the "balanced technological initiative," and the concept of "Follow-on Forces Attack" which have their roots in the doctrines of "flexible response" or "direct confrontation."

The urgent need to create a secure world and to prevent all types of war calls for new thinking, for a new approach to the solution of disarmament problems and it presupposes a renunciation of aggressive doctrines, offensive strategies, and concepts based on the use of the world community's scientific and technical achievements for military purposes. It is impossible not to be aware of the fact that the implementation of the ideas of diverse "compensations" and the improvement of existing weapons and development of new weapons, be they nuclear, chemical, or conventional would essentially undermine the accords which have already been reached. This is why it is impossible to allow—in parallel with disarmament in one sphere—the arms race to expand in others.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Shultz Geneva Meeting Under Way

Shevardnadze Arrives

LD1005144288 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Geneva May 10 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has arrived here from Moscow today. Under an agreement reached he is to meet with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz here on May 11-12.

Shevardnadze Makes Statement

LD1005170988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 10 May 88

[Text]Geneva, 10 May (TASS)—We have arrived, said E.A. Shevardnadze, addressing journalists gathered on the airport tarmac in Geneva, for another meeting with the U.S. Secretary of State—the 26th in the schedule of our regular contacts and the last one on the calendar to prepare for the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

This is what determines the significance, content, and aims of the current round of talks. Its format is traditional; it is set by such areas as problems of security and disarmament, regional conflicts, a variety of humanitarian problems, and bilateral relations.

In each of these areas we intend in the coming 2 days to make as much progress as possible. This also applies to the elaboration of a draft treaty for a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, which continues to remain a priority aim for both us, and, I presume, our U.S. partners.

Even if we don't succeed in achieving it before the Moscow summit meeting, we will make every effort to approach it as closely as possible. Having established this, the maximum level possible under current conditions, the Soviet Union and the United States of America continue to move toward the planned height.

For our delegation the stay in Geneva is associated with the fruitfulness of new political thinking. We hope that this time, too, good results will worthily crown the joint efforts of the sides in deepening the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, for which this city, its authorities and citizens, and the government of Switzerland are doing so much.

Taking advantage of the occasion, I would like to thank them for this and wish all the Swiss peace and prosperity.

Eduard Shevardnadze then replied to journalists' questions.

Shultz Arrives in Geneva

LD1105130188 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Geneva May 11 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived here today for a meeting with Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

Ministerial Talks Begin

LD1105140488 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Geneva May 11 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz opened talks at the U.S. mission in Geneva today.

They will discuss preparations for Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, security and disarmament problems, regional conflicts, the package of humanitarian issues, and bilateral relations.

The talks will be continued tonight at the permanent mission of the USSR to the U.N. office in Geneva.

Prospects for Talks Considered

LD1005142288 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 10 May 88

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, and his American counterpart, George Shultz, open the 2-day-long talks in Geneva on 11th May. Yuriy Solton has this comment:

The central issue will be the preparation for a new Soviet-American summit, due to be held in Moscow from 29th May to 2d June. The range of questions for discussion at the forthcoming meeting has already been outlined. It includes disarmament, regional conflicts, human rights and Soviet-American relations. The political dialogue at such a high level is always useful. Any attempts at clearing up relations between the two states possessing the most powerful military and economic potentials has its bearing on the entire situation in the world, the more so if there are concrete results.

At present we expect further progress in the solution of the central issue, the 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States in the conditions when the provisions of the ABM Treaty are strictly honored. Last December, following the signing by the Soviet Union and the United States of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, many thought that the draft agreement on strategic weapons would be prepared by the arrival of President Reagan in Moscow. In reality, everything

turned out to be much more complicated. I wouldn't like to go into detail, but still I cannot help but note that the behavior of the American delegation was marked all the time by a certain inner resistance and even by the departure from the decisions taken at the very top.

There is no doubt that certain progress in the preparation of the agreement has been achieved, but we'll be able to find out how big it is only following the termination of the current talks between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz, who will try to untangle all the remaining problems.

It's obvious that the ratification of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles would help create a favorable atmosphere at the Moscow summit. The debate on that score was to open at the American Senate on 11th May, but representatives of the Democratic Party—and they are in the majority—began to drag the whole business out. At first it was unclear to them if the provisions of the treaty spread on to future weapons of the same class as well. Now they claim that, as far as the verification issue is concerned, the interests of the United States have allegedly been infringed upon. Such claims, as it has been stressed by competent Soviet circles, do not correspond to reality. The Soviet side believes that there are no problems that could hamper the normal process of the treaty's ratification by the two countries.

Possibly Democratic senators realize this themselves, but they prefer to maneuver in order to spite the Republican administration and prevent their rival party to score some points before the forthcoming presidential elections. To my mind, however, it would be most irresponsible to make the treaty opening the way to a nuclear disarmament depending [as heard] on the inter-party differences.

We have lately witnessed a certain thawing in the international atmosphere. The meaningful negotiations between the Soviet and American leaders have largely contributed to this, I think. We'd like to believe that the forthcoming Moscow summit would become another step in that direction.

Further on Senate Postponement of INF Debate

LD1005181588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 10 May 88

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Valentin Dvinin]

[Text] Reports from Washington today note that discussion of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles in the full Senate has been postponed indefinitely. This was stated on Monday by Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate; Robert Dole, leader of the Republican minority in this house of the Congress, stated his agreement with this decision. An official White House representative refused to comment on the Senate leaders' decision, stressing: We have always pointed out that the INF Treaty speaks for itself.

The problems connected with the treaty which are now being raised in the Senate, are not problems between the USSR and the United States Paul Nitze, special advisor to the President and U.S. secretary of state on questions of arms control, said. These problems, he believes, are problems between different members of the Senate, and also, to some extent, problems between the executive authority and the Senate. Nitze expressed the hope that the disagreements might be settled quite quickly, which will make it possible to complete the process of ratifying the INF Treaty before the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow.

More on Postponement

PM1005151188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "United States: Discussion of Soviet-U.S. Treaty Postponed"]

[Text] Washington, 10 May—The discussion of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles at a full session of the upper house of the U.S. Congress has been postponed indefinitely, Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, announced Monday.

Robert Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, stated his agreement with the decision, noting that the postponement of the debate has the backing of the White House. But an official White House spokesman refused to comment on the Senate leaders' decision, stressing: "We have always indicated that the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles speaks for itself."

"In our view," Byrd declared, "not only have the problems that surfaced before not been solved yet, but new ones have appeared." "There has not been a meeting of minds on problems of monitoring observance of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles," David Boren, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, explained. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, "if the disagreements over the rules for monitoring observance can be quickly resolved, the full Senate will be able to start discussing the treaty immediately."

But judging by what Byrd said at the meeting with journalists, the Democrats' leaders in the Senate intend to continue to delay the opening of the debate on the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles obviously because of the political game surrounding the presidential campaign in the United States. In this way the Democrats hope to generate publicity for their position in the discussion of the Soviet-U.S. agreement and retrospectively belittle the significance of the fact that

the important treaty was signed by a Republican President. Byrd also intimated that the process of ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles could be seriously hampered if Reagan vetoes the trade bill approved by Congress on the Democrats' initiative.

The problems connected with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles which are now being raised in the Senate "are not problems between the USSR and the United States," Paul Nitze, special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms control issues, said. "These problems are partly problems between different members of the Senate, and also, to some extent, problems between the executive and the Senate." Nitze expressed the hope that the differences can be settled quickly enough to allow the process of ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles to be completed before the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow.

Reagan, Republicans Discuss INF

LD1005222788 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1729 GMT 10 May 88

[Report by TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington, 10 May (TASS)—President Reagan met in the White House today with the Republican leadership in the Senate. To judge from a statement by participants, the meeting discussed the situation concerning the ratification by the Senate of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, in light of the announcement on Monday of a decision by the Senate leadership to postpone for an indefinite period the start of debates on ratification. They were planned for 11 May. Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, stated that the start of debates has been postponed in connection with "the appearance of new problems" in the area of monitoring [proverki] observance of the treaty.

"We are in an optimistic mode on the whole," stated Senator Richard Lugar (Republican, state of Maine), answering a question about whether the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will be ratified by the time President Reagan visits Moscow. "Goodwill is being shown by both parties, as well as the wish to see the treaty ratified," he continued. "There are problems, but in our view the USSR wants to have this treaty. We want to have such a treaty. There are things which require elucidation...the problems are serious, and that is why the secretary of state is going to Geneva. He, and also Colin Powell, presidential aide on national security, will hold very serious talks there....."

Senator Alan Simpson (Republican, state of Wyoming) pointed out that "three of four problems remain unresolved." He pointed out that the Republicans in the Senate "want to ratify the treaty." Senator Simpson said, "If these three or four problems are settled, the debates will proceed smoothly, without arguments, and we will be in a position to move forward rapidly."

U.S. Vetoes UN Security Council Resolution

LD1005230988 Moscow TASS in English 2303 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] New York May 10 TASS—Casting the only against vote, the U.S. representative today vetoed a United Nations Security Council resolution denouncing a recent Israeli incursion into Lebanon.

The document, submitted by the group of non-aligned countries, condemned the massive thrust into south Lebanon and demanded that all armed forces be immediately removed from Lebanese territory and that all actions violating Lebanon's sovereignty and the security of its civilians be terminated.

The resolution also stressed the need to respect Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders.

The other Security Council members supported the document.

By shielding the aggressor, the United States, many delegates said at the sitting, encourages it to continue with impunity its brigandage against neighbors and its expansionism threatening general peace and security.

Torpedoing attempts to bridle the aggressor, Washington undermines the prestige of the United Nations and the Security Council as a tool for maintaining peace and security.

Reagan 'Contradictory' on Iran-Contra Pardons

LD1105100788 Moscow TASS in English 0937 GM 11 May 88

["Reagan's Contradictory Statements on Iran-Contra Pardons"—TASS headline]

[Text] Washington May 11 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatiyev reports:

President Reagan has made it clear that he does not rule out the possibility of pardons for the main characters of the Iran-contra operation against whom criminal charges of perjury, destruction of documents, fraud, as well as personal enrichment at the expense of federal funds. [sentence as received]

Obviously contradicting his own pronouncements made the day before, the U.S. President firmly said "no" when the journalists on Tuesday asked him to specify whether he had definitely ruled out the possibility of pardons for his former assistant for national security affairs, John M. Poindexter, and former high-ranking staff member of the National Security Council, Oliver L. North.

In an interview given to syndicated columnist Carl Rowan, President Reagan stated on Monday that the question of pardon could not be considered before the case is closed.

The President said that to pardon anyone before a trial would leave the cloud of guilt on through the years. These quotations were read out by an official spokesman of the White House who said official transcript of the interview would not be circulated in full.

Carl Rowan, for his part, when describing his interview with the President in the W.U.S.A. TV network, said President Reagan "did not believe in giving pardons before people are convicted of anything". Moreover, the President said he would not have to decide on the pardon issue at all. He apparently meant that by the time the trial ends he would already resign the powers of the head of state.

An official spokesman for the White House, who was asked on Tuesday to explain the contrdictoriness in the President's pronouncements, maintained that "this means that no definitive decision has been made" about pardons for the main characters of the Iran-contra case: Poindexter, North, and their assistants—businessman Albert Hakim and retired General Richard Secord.

The decision made on March 16 by the grand jury to institute criminal proceedings against the four obviously displeased Reagan.

Ten days later the President said that the participants in the operation would be found not guilty because they had not violated laws and had not committed any crime.

At the same time the White House and the Department of Justice began to make efforts which are virtually aimed at frustrating the judicial proceedings against the participants in the undercover operation to ship arms to Iran and to divert profits to finance the contras.

Specifically, they still decline to declassify the documents requested by the lawyers of Poindexter, North, and their associates. Federal District Judge Gerhard Gessel has already warned that he would have to close the case against the participants in the affair if their lawyers do not gain access to the secret documents.

Such a situation suits the administration quite well. A postponement or frustration of the trial would be of extreme advantage to Vice-President George Bush who has already secured Republican Presidential nomination for the November elections. The start of court examination of the Iran-contra operation prior to the November elections, many an analyst believes, would strongly undermine Bush's chances for election, for questions of his involvement in the scandal would crop up again.

Carlucci Cited on Allies' Military Expenditure

PM1005135988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 May 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "F. Carlucci's Speech"]

[Text] Washington, 6 May—U.S. Secretary of Defense F. Carlucci delivered a speech in New York on Thursday devoted to the problem of the U.S. allies' military expenditure.

According to his aides, the speech was conceived as a response to the demands of a number of U.S. lawmakers for a "fair" redistribution of the burden of military expenditure within NATO.

Carlucci spoke about a growing trend toward isolationism, toward a kind of bias in favor of renouncing U.S. international obligations and interests. "The nature of our alliances is strategic, not philanthropic," he said in part. "We do not belong to alliances as a favor to our allies. We belong to them because this is in keeping with our interests."

Policy Experts Present Joint Study on Relations

PM1005115788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin dispatch: "Dialogue Down on Paper"]

[Text] Washington—Dialogues bring people together and strengthen mutual understanding. In this instance Soviet and U.S. scientists and specialists have not only found a common language: A productive dialogue has gone down on paper, and the result is a serious study of questions of Soviet-U.S. relations. It is a joint report drawn up by well-known Soviet and U.S. experts on foreign policy problems.

The study, work on which lasted 3 years, has aroused great interest in Washington political and scientific circles. Leading commentators for the U.S. capital's newspapers and television gathered for a press conference. Journalists were familiarized with the history and the results of this important political study by Academician G.A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada, who headed the group of Soviet experts, and by the leader on the U.S. side—Arthur Macy Cox, the well-known researcher into political problems and secretary of the public organization the Committee on U.S.-Soviet Relations.

"The Soviet Union and the United States are now on the threshold of historic opportunities and substantial mutually advantageous changes in their relations." These words from the joint report brought to the attention of the representatives of the press could be made the epigraph of the whole study. Its chief purpose is to

formulate specific recommendations which will contribute to the search for further paths to mutual understanding between the two countries and serve, above all, the goals of peace.

The report emphasizes that the USSR and the United States today bear special responsibility to mankind in the matter of maintaining peace. Neither country can achieve security by inflating unilateral military programs. Military superiority is an illusion. The United States and the USSR must secure conditions for stable coexistence, and it cannot lie in the sphere of competitions in the military sphere. Coexistence is necessary for joint survival in the nuclear age. This is an axiom which does not require proof.

The study touched on the most urgent problem today—the problem of nuclear disarmament. It actively supports the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles concluded between the USSR and the United States and welcomes the important new step—the elaboration of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms. Special attention is devoted to the need to eliminate "first-strike" weapons. Other recommendations in the study—and there are 14 in all—point to the importance of observing the ABM Treaty and also analyze questions relating to chemical weapons, conventional arms, regional problems, and others.

I talked with a number of the U.S. representatives involved in drawing up this important study. William Colby and George Ball, for example. As is known, one of them held the post of CIA director and is now a specialist in arms control issues, devoting special attention to problems of monitoring fulfillment of concluded agreements. The other was U.S. deputy secretary of state and U.S. representative at the United Nations. He now does scientific research work in the sphere of international relations. They both welcomed the process of developing the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, which has resulted, for example, in the joint work which has just been produced. George Ball pointed to the need for Soviet-U.S. cooperation at the United Nations. UN problems are one of the issues in the Soviet-U.S. joint study. Cooperation at the United Nations is necessary, as G. Ball emphasized, to help this organization to be an effective instrument in maintaining lasting peace.

Visit to WASHINGTON POST Described

PM1005121988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 May 88 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Report by A. Blinov on visit to the WASHINGTON POST office under the general heading "Reports From the Editorial Offices of American Newspapers": "THE WASHINGTON POST"]

[Text] They agreed to receive me right away at the WASHINGTON POST editorial office. I talked with Foreign Editor M. Getler. I asked him the following questions:

[Blinov] How has your newspaper's coverage of life in the USSR changed in the past few years?

[Getler] In the past few years, the USSR has become "big news" in the U.S. press. Our newspaper—the largest in the U.S. capital—is permanently represented in Moscow. We quickly increased the number of staffers at our Moscow Bureau to two accredited correspondents. When one goes on assignment elsewhere in the country, the other stays behind to keep up with political information. It is our rule now not to leave Moscow for a single day.

THE WASHINGTON POST and its correspondents in the USSR now cover a broader range of themes and give readers far more detailed coverage of daily life in the Soviet Union. People in Washington are known for their heightened interest in politics. For example, they are especially interested in changes in the Soviet leadership. Nowadays, they follow Mr Gorbachev's activity closely and ask about the kind of challenge that the current Soviet leadership presents to leaders in the United States and other countries.

The process of restructuring in the Soviet Union is arousing special interest here, of course. A period of historic importance, as I understand it, has begun in your country's life. A struggle is under way to change many things which had been customary for decades. This is a really important subject, however it turns out. The crucial task of those who write about the USSR is to describe restructuring and its outcome.

[Blinov] How has the course of expanding glasnost affected the activity of U.S. correspondents in Moscow?

[Getler] The course of greater glasnost and openness is making various types of information in the USSR more accessible.

There are more press conferences and briefings for journalists.

Our correspondents follow with great interest the debates in your newspapers, speeches by scientists, and the publication of readers' letters. Although it is true that the hunger for information about the Soviet Union is far from sated.

I should also like to see more interviews with representatives of the country's leadership, broader access to middle-ranking leaders, and opportunities for meetings with "dissidents."

[Blinov] Can you cite examples of restrictions on meetings with "dissidents"? Given the full diversity of opinions in our country, whom do you have in mind here?

[Getler] I do not have specific examples to give at this moment, but I would still like to stress in general that we are very interested in the problem of "alternative opinions."

[Blinov] What could be done to improve mutual understanding between our peoples? For instance, to help overcome the long-standing "enemy image" that has been created—is it the result of imputing aggressive intentions to the other side and exaggerating its military might?

[Getler] We think that corrections to our peoples' image of one another must be made by the flow of information itself. facts, clearly, are more important than editorial articles. Thus, without getting into the question of who writes editorial articles—this is a separate department here—I would note that information received directly from the USSR should play the paramount role in removing stereotypes. The well-informed reader will be able to make the necessary corrections to his image of the Soviet Union himself.... [Getler ends]

While visiting THE WASHINGTON POST, I also discussed this theme with the journalist J. Anderson.

"In recent years," he told me, "American readers' interest in the Soviet people's life has increased extraordinarily. I think that there is no other country in the world which has attracted Americans' attention to such an extent. Unfortunately, we have still not done everything to correct our wrong impressions of each other. I believe that blame attaches to both the U.S. and the Soviet press. It is necessary to understand each other better and to realize our common interest—which, in my view, undoubtedly exists.

"For me, the course of expanding glasnost in the Soviet Union is of special significance. You are revealing and criticizing shortcomings. And this leads to increased confidence in you and your press. I hope that this will help us to understand each other better."

China

Commentary Praises Stand on Nuclear Testing

OW0705011288 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 5 May 88

[Station commentary: "Encouraging Results in Cooperation Between Soviet and American Scientists"]

[Text] Soviet and American scholars have smoothly completed their joint experiment at the Nevada nuclear test site in the United States. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told a reporter that this experiment is further convincing proof that seismological method may be used to monitor small-scale nuclear tests. Our station commentator writes in this connection:

I wish to point out that the Soviet and the American scholars were not instructed by their respective governments to test the apparatus and its sensitivity, as well as the possibility for monitoring nuclear explosions. This joint effort was started at the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site in the Soviet Union in 1986 at the proposal of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The results obtained are not supposed to be the official and original documents for handling questions related to nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and the United States. In this sense, this was a special plan agreed upon by the two governments.

In January this year, work groups of experts from the Soviet and the U.S. Governments visited the nuclear test sites in each other's countries to test and monitor the means for conducting nuclear explosions. Both sides also agreed to conduct work in other fields within this project. The joint experiment by the Soviet and the U.S scholars was still an important one, although it was not directed by their governments.

Many American newspapers consider this joint experiment a way to eliminate, as soon as possible, all obstacles on the road to a complete halt to nuclear testing. If this were within the control of the Soviet Union, this question would have been solved long ago. The Soviet Union unilaterally stopped all nuclear tests for more than a year, convincing proof of Soviet willingness to commit itself. Regrettably, the U.S. Government did not follow the Soviet example at that time.

The U.S. Government has suggested that, as an intermediate step, the first task is to pave the way for ratifying the 1974 and the 1976 treaties on restricting nuclear explosions and for reaching an agreement on reducing the power and frequency of nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union was not opposed to this. Since the United States considers it necessary to testing the monitoring system, we naturally agree to cooperate. At present, the most important thing is to advance toward the ultimate goal—a complete halt to nuclear tests.

We are aware that China also attaches great importance to this matter. We highly appraise the fact that China did not conduct any nuclear explosions during the period when the Soviet Union refrained from conducting nuclear tests.

Economist Eyes 'Breakthroughs' in Reform

PM1005155388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Liu Guoguang, vice president of the PRC Academy of Social Sciences, by own correspondent Yu. Savenkov in Beijing: "Reform: Looking for a Face"; date not given—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Liu Guoguang is one of the most authoritative economists in China and vice president of the Academy of Social Sciences. Journalists often turn to Liu Guoguang to get their bearings at the crossroads of opinions on ways to develop the country. Our IZVESTIYA correspondent prepared some questions for him.

[Savenkov] I like this energetic Chinese word "tupo," or "breakthrough," like a rapier thrust. You discussed the ten "tupos" in economic theory in the journal REFORM. China has now entered the 10th year of its renewal. What, in your opinion, are the main "breakthroughs" in the transformations affecting every sphere of life?

[Guoguang] The first "breakthrough" was the revival of enterprises and increase in their vitality. This is reflected in the "weakening" of the old system of ownership and in the abandonment of the traditional concept which says the higher the level of social ownership, the better. During the reform years, structural diversity [mnogouk-ladnost] has appeared, together with different methods of economic management at enterprises. Their rights have become more extensive and, possibly most important of all, the amount of the profit an enterprise can now retain has increased. In the past, we compared an enterprise to the beads on an abacus. They could not move of their own accord but required a tallyman to move them.

The second "breakthrough" was the "formation of the market," whose role is constantly increasing. The sphere of centralized planning, distribution, and price formation has diminished. Let me give you a few figures. The list of products controlled by the State Planning Commission has been reduced from 123 types of product in 1980 to 60 in 1986, and its proportion of gross industrial output has been reduced from 40 to 20 percent. Sixty-five percent of agricultural products, 55 percent of industrial consumer goods, and 40 percent of means of production in industry are sold at floating and market prices.

The product list of unified state material and technical supply and planned distribution in trade has been sharply reduced. The beginnings of input markets have appeared: Land, equipment, manpower, real estate, capital, services, and means of production—and the latter are the most developed. So commodity-money relations have begun to permeate every sphere of economic life. The foundations of a new economic mechanism are being laid. The state regulates the market and the market guides enterprises' activity.

The third "breakthrough" deals with changes regarding the distribution of income between the state enterprise, workers, and employees. There has been a particularly noticeable drop in the state's share of general investments in production and exchange (from 76 percent to 31 percent), while the share of bank credits has increased (from 23 percent to 68 percent). All this is connected with the gradual move away from the traditional administrative economic management toward qualitative regulation via taxes, interest rates, and credit.

The fourth "breakthrough" is "kaifang." (There is a reason for my retaining the Chinese term here. In our literature it is usually translated as an "expansion of ties with the outside world," meaning an "open, outward-looking policy." This course is based on borrowing foreign capital, importing equipment, actively developing foreign trade, and involving the Chinese economy in the international economic division of labor, but that is a subject for another discussion. But "kaifang" is a complex phenomenon. It also implies liberation from the bonds of stereotypes, a relaxation. And it presupposes openness within the country itself.—Yu.S.). Previously the Chinese economy was a subsistence rather than commodity-based economy. Whatever happened, you did not turn to someone else for assistance—this was the principle. This led to departmental and geographical isolationism. There was no commodity exchange. Everything was produced within a closed circle. Whether it was profitable or unprofitable was not important. "Although the sparrow is small, it has all its internal organs." But now a commodity-based economy has appeared, vertical administration has begun to be replaced by a horizontal economic line. Economic associations are springing up.

[Savenkov] Chinese people say that the reform has given rise to new problems....

[Guoguang] There are a considerable number of problems, but the cure for our ills is well known: reform. Enterprises happily exercise the right to keep some of the profits. But, as there is no mechanism to ensure the rational distribution of resources, there is sometimes a chaotic increase in the payment of wages and bonuses, unwarranted inflation of the consumer fund, and haggling over the share of the profit. This is on the one hand. On the other, there is as yet no mechanism of responsibility for losses, and enterprises have no wish to answer for their losses. Again they look to the state to prop them up. Some areas are reverting to a directive-based plan. The reasoning behind it is this: All right, it fetters initiative, but at least it provides a guarantee of sale and supply. There is another difficulty: We are still feeling our way with economic levers and have no experience in applying them. It is particularly difficult to control the situation as a whole. One lever works; another has no effect. As a result, the sharply increased capital investment in fixed capital led, for example, to overloading of the economy in 1985-1986. A move away from the enforced coexistence of new and old economic models toward domination by the new is possible only if the constant surplus of aggregate demand over supply is eliminated. Prices increase as a result.

[Savenkov] Some people believe that inflation is a product of reform. Is this so?

[Guoguang] No, it existed even before the reform, albeit covertly. It exists in China, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union. Surely lines caused by shortages are a sign of inflation? Prices are stable, but there are no commodities. The consumer resorts to the "black market" and pays triple the price. Now the picture is different: Prices are higher, but at least there is something to buy.

Another difficulty is that differences in income have arisen. This is useful for efficiency. Whoever works better and is the more competent manager must receive more; otherwise, the commodity-based economy will not develop.

But a great many loopholes have appeared for unlawful gain and speculation, and control functions are still absent. Sometimes it is even impossible to check because some private economic units have no accounts or books. Wage-leveling practices are deeply rooted in the past. The banners of the peasant uprisings proclaimed the word "Equality." This was interpreted in the sense of egalitarian distribution. Customs like these, which have been handed down from generation to generation, are tenacious. People have to be psychologically reeducated but, on the other hand, we cannot allow too great a difference in income levels. We cannot allow extremes in our social policy. This is a serious issue when it comes to the remuneration of the intelligentsia. We will be honest: The surgeon's scalpel earns less than the barber's scissors. Society is still unable to resolve this contradiction.

[Savenkov] In China and abroad, there are people who think that reform is leading to a departure from socialism. They refer in this regard to shares, private enterprises, and hired labor.

[Guoguang] The concept of the initial stage means that socialism does exist in China, although the level of its maturity is still low. What is the sign of socialism? Social ownership. This form of ownership is predominant in our country. As for ownership, that is not socialist but individual, private, or based on foreign capital—there we find hired labor, without a doubt. But the form of ownership is determined by the level of productive forces and the objective needs of development. Incidentally, the proportion of this sector is almost insignificant: 2 percent of the gross industrial output. Even if it were to increase 10 times (!) socialist ownership would still account for 80 percent. I am sure that different forms of ownership will benefit the economy and stimulate competition, without which there can be no progress.

The root of the reform is to divide the right of ownership from the right of economic management. Economic management can take any of various forms: contract, lease, joint-stock production organization. But the state retains the right of ownership. These rights used to be confused. It is true, however, that sometimes the state has to fulfill both roles—in sectors such as nuclear power, for example.

[Savenkov] What is your opinion of the restructuring period in the USSR? Do you see any potential for cooperation between the two countries in the area of economic reform?

[Guoguang] The last time I was in the Soviet Union was almost 6 years ago, before restructuring began. If I have the opportunity to go there now, I will try to get a detailed picture of how full economic accountability works in your country. It seems to me that the restructuring process in the USSR is making steady progress. This is particularly important for a large state. The need for political reform is arising in both countries. The changes are perhaps more apparent in our economy, but these two spheres are interconnected. We are also carrying out structural reform. Many phenomena in our lives are similar: glasnost in your country and the system of dialogue and consultation in ours. They serve the same aim—the democratization of society. In short, you are doing many things to which we should pay close attention.

12th Communist Youth League Congress Ends

PM1105120088 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 p 3

[Special correspondent L. Arikh and TASS correspondent M. Abulkhatin report: "Under the Sign of Change: 12th Communist Youth League Congress Ends in Beijing"]

[Text] Beijing—The attention of the Chinese public and mass media was focused on the debates taking place at the working parties' sessions in the Goyibinguan Hotel. The CPC Central Committee organ RENMIN RIBAO acknowledged, for instance: "Today nobody says there is no need to educate young people. But many make no contribution to this cause...."

The need for such heightened attention toward youth problems has not arisen overnight. This was stated quite clearly at the congress. The report delivered by Song Defu, first secretary of the Chinese Communist Youth League Central Committee, was severely criticized. In the opinion of Li Weidong, chairman of the Heilongjiang University student society, it contained too many theoretical and programmatic expositions and too few concrete, specific answers to numerous questions posed by the times.

...The final day of the congress: The resolution adopted by the congress notes, in particular, that since the 3d plenum of the CPC Central Committee's 11th convocation, which took place in 1978, the Communist Youth League's activity has been filled with new content. In conditions of reform and the open-door policy, the resolution stresses, Komsomol organizations are called upon to support in every way the party's line of building socialism in light of the specific features of the country's development.

The congress believes, the document goes on to say, that it is necessary to continue to make energetic efforts to implement a structural reform of the Komsomol. This should take place under the sign of democratization and the resolute renunciation of administrative rule.

While we were writing these lines, a report came in that the congress delegates have approved the Communist Youth League Central Committee report, taking into account amendments submitted in the course of the discussion. Amendments to the Chinese Communist Youth League Statutes and the league's anthem were also approved. A total of 165 members and 70 candidate members of the Chinese Communist Youth League Central Committee have been elected to form the new Central Committee. The plenum at which the league's leadership will be elected is to take place in a few days' time.

Northeast Asia

Soviet Far East 'Special Economic Zone'

OW1005133788 Tokyo KYODO in English 1321 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Tokyo, May 10 KYODO—The Soviet Union is studying the possible establishment of a special economic zone—like those of China—in the Soviet Far Eastern region, the president of TASS news agency said here Tuesday.

The revelation was made by Sergey Andreyevich Losev, president of the Soviet state news agency, in an interview with Asahi Kameyama, managing editor of KYODO news service, in Tokyo.

He is here at KYODO's invitation.

Losev said that most of the products manufactured by Soviet-Japanese joint ventures in the special economic zone could be earmarked for supply to the Soviet market.

The idea represents a departure from the past posture of the Soviet Union, which used to be quite negative toward proposals for establishment of China-type special economic zones.

Since the enforcement of a joint venture law in January last year, the Soviet Union has assumed a more positive attitude toward the introduction of foreign capital and technology. Nevertheless, the Soviet restraints on the activities of foreign businesses remain quite strong.

Losev was replying to a question by Kameyama: "Does the Soviet Union have any intention of establishing special economic zones of the China type?" The TASS chief said the proposal is under study by an authoritative agency. Newspapers frequently carry calls by readers for the establishment of special economic zones in the Soviet Union. Losev said he himself inspected the special economic zones in Shanghai and Shenzhen when he visited China last year. From the angle of Russo-Japanese cooperation, the establishment of a special economic zone in the Soviet Far Eastern area may also be considered, he said.

As for joint venture law stipulations that the foreign ownership of a joint venture should be below 50 percent and the president of the joint firm must be a Soviet, Losev indicated the possibility of an amendment of the provisions. He pointed out that China has frequently amended its joint venture law. Losev said that while the Supreme Soviet has approved the legislation, it may be revised, based on careful observation of the results of administration of the law.

The Soviet joint venture law has been considered as intended mainly to facilitate the introduction of foreign technology and to promote the export of joint venture products. Further, since the law puts severe restraints on the remittance overseas of joint venture profits, Japanese enterprises have been quite wary of setting up such ventures with Soviet partners. So far, only two joint venture contracts have been concluded with the Soviets, both of them in the lumber-processing field.

It is believed that Losev's flexible reply was a response to Japanese dissatisfaction. Referring to political relations between the two countries, the TASS president stressed that the time has come to open a new era.

Asked whether a tentative visit to Japan this fall by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze would open the way for a visit to Japan by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, Losev replied that such a visit would depend on efforts by both sides. The Soviets believe that a Japan visit by the Soviet Communist Party secretary general must produce "concrete and positive" results.

Losev said the hub of international politics is shifting to the Asian area. Japan is playing an important role in this region, he added.

Asked whether the Soviet telecasting April 29 of an Emperor's Day congratulatory address by Japanese Ambassador to the Soviet Union Toshiaki Muto, who referred to the disputed "northern territories" in the address, without cutting the expression, indicated a change in the Soviet position on the territorial problem. Losev replied in the negative.

He said there was no change whatever in the Soviet Union's official position.

Japanese Socialist Delegation Visits Moscow

Okuno's Resignation Demanded

OW1105100788 Tokyo KYODO in English 0920 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 11 KYODO—Japan Socialist Party leader Takako Doi on Wednesday slammed State Minister Seisuke Okuno for defending Japan's wartime actions and demanded his resignation.

Doi told Japanese reporters accompanying her on the Soviet visit that Okuno has offended the Chinese and damaged the world's confidence in Japan.

"It is a fair attitude (for Okuno) to express his resignation," the leader of the top opposition party said.

She said if Okuno does not resign, her party will ask Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita to dismiss him.

Okuno denied that Japan acted aggressively during World War II in a speech before a House of Councillors committee meeting. He made a similar statement last month, angering China and South Korea.

Doi arrived here last Wednesday for a nine-day visit to the Soviet Union and held talks with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on Friday.

She told reporters Wednesday that both Prime Minister Takeshita and his immediate predecessor Yasuhiro Nakasone have admitted Japan's aggressive conduct in the last war.

Okuno's statement, therefore, shows a "cabinet disunity" and Takeshita should "punish" him, she said.

Doi welcomed a report that her party Dietman has been allowed to enter South Korea as a member of a supra-partisan Diet group promoting sports to inspect this year's Seoul Olympics' facilities.

South Korea, which regards the JSP as hostile to that country, has changed its mind and decided to grant a visa for Kenjiro Kawamata for a Seoul visit May 25-27.

Received by Kamentsev

LD1005164388 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—Vladimir Kamentsev, vice-chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has received today the delegation of the Socialist Party of Japan led by its chairman Takako Doi.

Questions of Soviet-Japanese trade and economic cooperation at the present stage were discussed. It was noted that there are all conditions for a further development of that cooperation, including its new forms such as the setting up of joint ventures and production cooperation. Special attention was devoted to the development of coastal trade.

The Soviet side gave answers to numerous questions of the head and the members of the delegation as regards the decisions taken in the Soviet Union on perestroyka and perfection of foreign economic activities.

Japanese Parliamentarian Itoyama Departs

LD0805175488 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 8 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS—Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the House of Representatives of Japanese parliament Eitaro Itoyama left the Soviet Union today. He was staying in the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

Talks on Japanese Salmon Catch Quota Ends

PM0905154588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Japanese Fishermen Get Reduced Quota"]

[Text] Soviet-Japanese consultations on the procedure and terms governing Japanese fishing in the northwest Pacific Ocean for salmon that spawn in the rivers of the Soviet Far East ended in Moscow on 30 April. With regard to species of fish with river and sea development cycles, the 1982 UN Law of the Sea Convention says that the state of origin has not only preferential rights concerning the exploitation of these bioresources but also a responsibility for their condition and safety along the entire migration route. The Soviet Union, sticking to its principled position that sea fishing of salmon is destructive since it is doing irreparable damage to the population, has over a long period annually reduced the Japanese fishermen's catch quota and has announced a total ban on it by 1992 in the Pacific Ocean outside its 200-mile zone.

As a result of the consultations which have ended in Moscow, the Japanese fishermen's salmon catch quota for this year is 20,800 tonnes, which is nearly 4,000 tonnes less than in 1987.

Golts Assails ROK General's Visit to Japan

PM1005110588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[A. Golts "Military-Political Commentary": "In the Bloc Web"]

[Text] General Choe Se-chik, chairman of the South Korean Chiefs of Staff Committee, has visited Japan. For the first time, a South Korean visitor of this rank did not confine himself to talks with the leadership of the Japanese military department but also met with representatives of the command of the U.S. troops stationed in this country. Moreover, he visited two U.S. military bases—Kadena airbase and Camp Butler, a Marine base. It has thus been graphically confirmed that militarist circles in the three countries want to throw together a military alliance between Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul. For it is no secret that for a long time these circles have not liked the existence of merely bilateral military

agreements between the United States and Japan and South Korea. They are sparing no efforts to seek an excuse to develop direct contacts in this sphere between Tokyo and Seoul.

This time the upcoming Olympic Games served as the pretext. The South Korean general's present visit to Japan was also allegedly organized with a view to preparing for "collectively ensuring security at the Olympics." As a result of the consultations, it was stated that Japan is ready to hold large-scale naval maneuvers in the immediate vicinity of the Korean peninsula before the opening of the Games. As for the Pentagon, it had earlier announced its intention to send one or two carrier groups to South Korean shores at that time. Now Choe Se-chik has visited precisely those U.S. military bases that are intended as the main staging posts in the event of an emergency transfer of additional U.S troop contingents to the south of the peninsula. All this is supposedly to demonstrate the "three countries' readiness to repel any attempts to interfere in the holding of the Olympics." In fact, it is an attempt to coordinate more closely the military actions of Japan, South Korea, and the United States.

It is indicative that all this is taking place against the backdrop of a South Korean buildup of military might. According to KYODO, Seoul has already placed contracts with West German firms to build at least four submarines. Britain is not lagging behind the FRG either. Just recently British Defense Secretary Younger signed a memorandum on conditions for military shipments to South Korea. According to the DAILY TELEGRAPH, their volume has increased by a factor of 20 in a year. Suffice it to say that the value of a single deal alone amounted to 9 million pounds, and contracts on an even larger scale are in the offing.

Washington, albeit tacitly, is encouraging this process. For the implementation of such plans serves not only to militarize South Korea but also to develop direct contacts between Seoul and European NATO countries. Pentagon strategists believe that such ties may help in the future to unite all U.S. allies into some kind of superbloc encompassing both the European and the Asian Continents.

Of course, such activity by no means helps strengthen security but, on the contrary, aggravates the already tense situation on the Korean peninsula. Security on the peninsula can be strengthened only if South Korea finally responds to the DPRK's call for dialogue and if Seoul's potential is channeled toward reducing armed confrontation and not toward increasing it.

DPRK Foreign Minister Makes Moscow Stopover

PM1005150388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 May 88 Morning Edition p3

[TASS report: "Stopover on the Way Home"]

[Text] Kim Yong-nam, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the Administration Council, and DPRK foreign minister, stopped over in Moscow on 7-8 May on his way home.

Envoy to Mongolia Replaced, Reassigned

PM0505140588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 88 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Vasiliy Ivanovich Sitnikov USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Mongolia.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade Konstantin Yefimovich Fomichenko of his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Mongolia in connection with his reassignment.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Thailand's Prem Tinsulanon on Upcoming Visit

LD1005140488 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Bangkok May 10 TASS—Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon of Thailand today granted an interview to TASS correspondent Boris Chekonin, which dealt, among other things, with the thoughts and expectations he would be carrying on his upcoming first visit to the Soviet Union.

The Thai head of government was asked, in particular, about what he anticipated from the trip in terms of ensuring his country's political and economic interests and enhancing its constructive role in international politics.

He gave the following reply:

"Thailand has long recognized the Soviet Union to be geographically also a part of Asia. The Soviet Union is, moreover, a global superpower with capabilities to influence events in the region that affect the destiny of the people in Southeast Asia and the region as a whole. Recently we have observed a new Soviet political orientation towards the Asia-Pacific region. We are encouraged by this trend.

"We believe that the Soviet Union, as a superpower and Pacific power, has an important role to play in promoting peace and contributing to the economic vitality of this region. This is a region of a great promise. We hope to be able to cooperate with the Soviet Union in a constructive manner in order to further our mutual interest in ensuring peace, stability and economic prosperity.

"With these thoughts in mind, I shall be traveling to Moscow to discuss with your leaders the practical ways in which we can cooperate for the benefit of both countries. In many respects, the development of our ties over the past few years has shown steady progress.

"I hope that my visit in May will add further impetus to the development of our bilateral relations."

The Thai premier, who has led the Government of Thailand and been the architect of its policy for eight years, was given also this question: "How could you assess the development of Thai-Soviet relations over this period and what can you say about their prospects?".

His answer was as follows:

"During my term in office I have noted with satisfaction the wider contacts between officials of the two governments in a joint effort to build up trust and confidence which is needed as the basic foundation for the intensification of relations between our two countries.

"Thailand has always been keen to see the Soviet Union play a greater role in resolving the Kampuchean conflict as it directly affects the security interests of Thailand. From the Thai point of view, the solution of the Kampuchean problem can only be achieved if the interests of all the parties concerned are taken into account. Under the present Soviet leadership Moscow has shown greater awareness and sensitivity to our security concerns. This is a welcomed development.

"We believe that the elimination of the main source of instability in the region through a political solution to the Kampuchean problem will pave the way for the expansion and intensification of Thai-Soviet relations in many areas, including those of trade and culture."

Noting the pressing need to settle international issues and develop mutually beneficial cooperation between countries on the basis of new political thinking, the TASS correspondent then asked the Thai head of government: "How will this new approach show itself, do you think, in Southeast Asia and in the Asia-Pacific region?"

Prem Tinsulanon replied:

"The world has already witnessed the signing of the INF Treaty and the Afghanistan accords which represent, among other things, positive manifestations of Mr. Gorbachev's new political thinking. These two events were indeed major landmarks in the positive development of East-West relations. They illustrate what can be achieved when the two superpowers get together in the spirit of cooperation.

"We hope that the prevailing positive atmosphere in the superpower relations will be further translated in joint constructive search of solutions to the problems facing the world today. These include not only the rolling back of the frontier of arms race that constantly threatens our very survival, but also the solving of the raging regional conflicts that continue to endanger us all.

"More specifically, we hope that it will result in a durable solution of the Kampuchean problem and the reduction of tension in the Asia-Pacific region. Eventually we hope that it will create an atmosphere that is conducive to cooperation in the economic and social development of the region for our mutual benefit."

Asked about his wishes to the participants in the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow later this month, the Thai prime minister said:

"We have noted with appreciation the forward strides achieved at previous summits. We will be wishing both sides every success in their endeavour to produce an agreement on the reduction of strategic weapons. This would indeed be a historic document marking the progress towards lessening the danger of nuclear holocaust.

"Equally important, we hope that both sides will strive to maintain the prevailing favourable atmosphere in Soviet-U.S. relations. There is no doubt that the state of superpower relations has a great impact on the rest of the world. We believe that such a positive atmosphere will contribute greatly to reducing global tensions."

Maltreatment of Vietnamese Workers Reported

PM1005101988 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 p 3

[Article by journalist I. Zisman under the rubric "20th Century Youth": "Tet in the 'Flophouse'"]

[Text] A sapling decorated with small pink flowers, firecracker explosions which scare the janitors, and the tantalizing smell of fried "nam" pancakes—these Tet holiday customs could be seen around the time of the lunar New Year in any one of the hundred hostels in our countries which house "SRV citizens mastering workers' skills directly in Soviet enterprises," as the intergovernmental agreement describes them. To put it more simply, they are Vietnamese boys and girls who have come to our country in order, first, to learn a vocation, second, to earn some money, and, third (cooperation must be mutually advantageous!), to help some of our enterprises in the current harsh conditions when economic accountability is imperiously knocking at the door.

"The road begins with the first step," according to the Vietnamese proverb. Our first step was meeting a Vietnamese group at the airport, accompanying its members while they settled down in a newly refurbished hostel, and being there while the enterprise purchased clothing for several hundred youngsters at once.

...Instead of chopsticks, a fork with the food always sliding off... Instead of a thermos flask from which you can sip tea all day long, a carafe of cold water.... Instead of the mat on a spacious and hard trestle bed on which they are accustomed to sleep, a narrow cot. It is forbidden to light joss sticks on top of the wardrobe—but where can you set up the shrine to your ancestors which is an integral part of every Vietnamese home? Where can you put up photographs of your relatives, where can you keep your precious letters and your other bits and pieces?...

Our esteemed hostel wardens are totally unaware of all this, but they are perfectly aware of something else (but what do you expect, they have been properly briefed!)—of the likelihood that some of the new arrivals might start trading in "varenka" or "seyka" [not further identified]; they are aware of it and they watch out for it!

But the first few months soon pass, and the "first freedoms" are gained: Smoking in the rooms—allowed! Putting up photographs of your loved one—allowed! Bringing fellow-countrymen from Vietnam into the hostel, on presentation of their passports—also allowed!

The three months spent on learning the Russian language flash by. Following my conversations with the Vietnamese youngsters, I can assert that this is the most blessed time for them.

And now let me turn to the most important point. For many years on end we were used to letting foreigners see us only from some special angle. But suddenly foreign citizens in the hundreds and even thousands are arriving in the most isolated regions of our country, at our enterprises (often backward), inside our hostels (not always ideal), and not just on a short trip but for several years, to do some proper work. They walk along our streets and come into contact with our people. Therefore, this decision involves not only boldness but also responsibility....

Extracts from letters sent by Vietnamese listeners to Radio Moscow:

"It seems to us very wrong that the workday lasts 8 hours when the actual work takes only 1-2 hours. For the rest of the time we hang about the shop floor. We smoke and chat. We would like to work harder.... But come the end of the month, it is all hands to the pumps. We work 12 hours at a stretch. Actually, we have nothing against it. It is a pity, however, that the promised time off is never given. Or they might promise us double pay for the extra work, and then not pay it. Obviously they tend to forget.... We often work on our days off: The shop foreman personally comes to the hostel, saying that we must get there, the plan is falling to bits. We realize that the Soviet comrades have families and children at home, and we always go to work. The only point is that the labor collective council is now making decisions about 'black Saturdays,' but we take no part in the council's sessions...."

"Generally speaking, visitors are allowed to enter the hostel from 1100 hours, but the trains arrive in the town early in the morning and Vietnamese visitors can often be seen waiting at the gate for 1-2 hours in the freezing cold."

So why not appoint Vietnamese residents to the hostel council and give them the right to decide for themselves the times when visitors are to be received: whether between 1100 and 2300 hours or between 0700 and 2000 hours, which, as a matter of fact, is more suited to their way of life?

In conformity with instructions, the Vietnamese workers' passports are held by the group leader. Often, however, zealous interpretation of their responsibility for "entrusted SRV citizens" impels enterprise administrations to hold on to the passports by hook or by crook. And then.... Say you have a train ticket but have not been able to get your passport, or you have heard of an opportunity to quickly send a letter or a gift home, or you simply wish to go somewhere further away from the hostel but have no passport, then the plant pass with your name and photograph will be of no use to you. I must admit that I was greatly surprised to learn that, in many of our cities, the word "Kapeze" [phonetic spelling of the acronym "KPZ," standing for "holding cell"] has been adopted in the Vietnamese language without translation. As has, by the way, the question: "Hey, kid, wanna go home?" And why are Vietnamese almost always addressed as "Hey, kid"? Simply because they look youthful? And incidentally, the fact that the Vietnamese are foreign citizens is at times taken into account only when it comes to paying for tickets or restaurant checks at "Intourist" prices, which, as a matter of fact, was recently deemed illegal by a spokesman for the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

Something else I find rather strange is the fact that all the instructions to Soviet citizens which deal with the Vietnamese properly cover only questions of "struggle against and prevention of breaches of the law," and there is no guidance on how to make Komsomol, sports, or cultural work more interesting. On the other hand, the Vietnamese are often lectured on "The Honor and Dignity of Young Girls" and "Moral and Ethical Norms of Everyday Behavior." Though it is quite unclear who decided that the right to play the role of lecturer on this question lies with us, rather than the other way round.

It is said that Vietnamese working at the Tolyatti Motor Vehicles Plant earn up to R500 a month. The parents of one of them, frequently citing their son's enthusiastic letters, have written to Radio Moscow to say this. But I would prefer to find out what is written home by the youngsters from Le Minh Tinh's group. The ones who

are "mastering worker trades" at the brick plant near Vladivostok, where one-third of the work force—300 people—are Vietnamese and the other two-thirds are "Soviet comrades who have undergone reeducation." "On the whole, they are all good, but some are bad," Nguyen [not further identified] says. "There is not always mutual understanding between us. It is a great pity that there is no Komsomol organization at the plant.... But the worst of all is the hostel, we live five to an extremely tiny room.... Work norms? We shift 13.5 tonnes of bricks a day. Mechanization? Wheelbarrows, handbarrows...."

And one last issue, probably the most painful one: improvement of skills and mastery of a related trade. The agreement states: The first trade is the one required by the plant, the second is at your own discretion.

Promotion should occur annually, with each worker being given 2 weeks for training. But I would not venture to say which enterprises are more numerous—the ones that observe or the ones that do not observe this provision of the agreement. An enterprise faces objective difficulties here: After all, it must seek out internal reserves. "The agreement does contain such a provision, we know about it. But we are in no position to obey it strictly—we have nobody to replace the Vietnamese on the job." I quote V.N. Tolstov, director of the "Altayselmash" Plant.

It seems to me that blame for the omission lies not only with the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the ministries, but also with us mass media workers for failing to bring the obvious truth to the notice of those who have to deal with SRV citizens: The agreement must be fulfilled, and even something over and above that ought to be done for them.

I would like to end on my conversation with that same V.N. Tolstov. When the local television correspondent and I arrived to interview the director, he said right into the camera words to the effect that "it is improper for our Soviet television to draw attention to these shortcomings." It is hard to agree with this view! Honest depiction of shortcomings, glasnost, and openness in relations with all countries and especially with a fraternal socialist country—this is indeed proper for us all.

Ship Repair Facility in Philippines Suggested

BK0905075888 Manila PNA in English 0706 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Cebu, Philippines May 9 (PNA/OANA)—The Soviet Union is considering transferring its ship repair facility from Singapore to the central Philippine city of Cebu, Mayor Tomas Osmena said Monday.

The plan, he said, was relayed to him by a group of visiting Soviet journalists led by Igor M. Kovalev, Southeast Asian bureau chief of IZVESTIYA, a state-run Soviet newspaper. A similar idea, Osmena said, was taken up with him last month during a call on him by Soviet ambassador to the Philippines, Oleg Sokolov.

The mayor said the Soviets felt it is more economical to relocate the ship repair facility, which services Soviet fishing vessels, from Singapore to the Philippines.

He said he favored the Soviet proposal since it would mean a five million US dollar in annual revenue for the city government.

But, he added, he expected it would run into diplomatic complications with the Philippine Government.

He argued, however, that if Singapore agreed to host the Soviet facility, he could not see any reason why Cebu City can not.

Near East & South Asia

Armed Forces Deputy Chief on Afghan Withdrawal

No 'Deviation' Planned

LD1105124788 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 11 May 88

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow May 11 TASS—The time of the Soviet troop withdrawal was dictated not by any advantages or disadvantages to the USSR but above all by the changes around Afghanistan. The Soviet military presence has been made unnecessary by Pakistan's signing of the agreement not to interfere in Afghanistan's affairs and to renounce intervention. Colonel-General Vladimir Lobov, first deputy chief of the general staff of the Soviet armed forces, said this in an interview published by the "MOSCOW NEWS" weekly today.

Questioned about the speed of withdrawal, the Soviet troop commander said that the order and time of withdrawal of troops are defined by the Geneva agreements. "Each step is fixed in time and linked with others. Any deviation from the schedule may trigger undesirable consequences. Observance of the agreements will be under strict international control," Vladimir Lobov said. He drew attention to the difficulties involved in the movement of troops in Afghan territory, exacerbated by the climatic conditions and by the actions of armed formations.

Everything is being done in order to avoid even accidental losses in the course of the troop withdrawal. The Western press is inclined to present the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan as their defeat. But we have not come to that country to win or lose a battle. We have come at the request of the Afghan people to help them to preserve their independence," Vladimir Lobov said in conclusion.

Rebels Plan To Attack

AU1105094588 Paris AFP in English 0936 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 11 (AFP)—Afghan rebels are preparing to launch attacks on the roads withdrawing Soviet troops will take on their way back to the Soviet Union, a senior military official said in an interview published Wednesday.

Information obtained by the Red Army showed the guerrillas "are preparing intensively for war on the roads," said General Vladimir Lobov, first deputy chief of staff of the armed forces.

But, he added, "if they force us to fight, we won't retreat."

(Meanwhile diplomats in Islamabad said big convoys of arms have been heading from Pakistan to Afghanistan in the past few weeks as the mujahidin rebels rush to build up their reserves before the Soviet pullout which starts officially on Sunday.

(Mujahidin rebels in southern Afghanistan have distributed leaflets in Ghazni town saying that they would allow the Soviets to leave peacefully, Western diplomats said in Islamabad Tuesday, but were meanwhile massing in the northern Lowgar valley where Soviet-Afghan troops abandoned two key security posts last week.)

Gen. Lobov's statements appeared in the daily MOSCOW NEWS in an article headlined "The Day Awaited for Nine Long Years."

Asked if the withdrawal of an estimated 150,000 troops constitutes the Red Army's first-ever defeat, Gen. Lobov said: "We didn't come to Afghanistan to win or lose a battle, but to help the Afghan people keep their independence."

An article in the latest edition of the trade union publication TRUD called for a monument to be erected in memory of soldiers killed in Afghanistan and for medals to be given them.

Paper Honors Reporter Killed in Afghan Ambush

PM0905105188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Performance of Their Duty....."]

[Excerpts] On the eve of Press Day, the bitter news came from Afghanistan that our comrade, IZVESTIYA journalist Aleksandr Sekretarev, had been killed. Sergey Sevruk, who was traveling in the same armored personnel carrier, was seriously wounded....

What happened on that distant highway and how did it happen? Alas, we cannot give the details today; the convoy in which they were traveling has still not reached Kabul. All that is known is that the ambush was en route to the Salang Pass.

We have managed to obtain two packets of negatives from them. The pictures show the peaceful life that is beginning on Afghan soil. But the photographs also exude the smoke of gunpowder from the continuing battles. One photoreportage has been published. The second envelope contained a brief note with what seemed an ordinary request: "Please look after these negatives—they were difficult to obtain." And there were two signatures—A. Sekretarev and S. Sevruk.

A day later the report of Sasha's death was received....

He had spent 2 weeks traveling around Afghanistan's smoldering land armed with his Leica and notebook. The editorial office was impatiently awaiting his return. Sasha was a reporter and a man on whom one could rely. A faultless worker and a loyal friend. [passage omitted]

There on the editor's desk lay his photographs from Afghanistan. They are published in today's edition. But Aleksandr's surname is edged in black.... The film taken from the camera which fell from his hands has not yet been developed. We still do not know the details of how he died. But as soon as we hear from our own correspondent in Afghanistan, the full report on what happened on that road in far-off Afghanistan will be published.

...In Orekhovo-Zuyevo, a town in the Moscow region, an ordinary Russian woman by the name of Mariya Kuzminichna and his two sisters, Svetlana and Galina, today donned black headscarves.

Meanwhile, grief befell his wife Olya and their two sons on Oleko Dundich street in Moscow....

Others were killed or wounded in that convoy.... And elsewhere. More than one home here has been afflicted by grief from Afghanistan. As we bid farewell to Sasha and express our concern for the fate of Sergey, whose last editorial assignment was to describe the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, we remember all who have not returned.

All of them, by name.

Worshippers Condole Slain Kabul Citizens

LD1005165088 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] At the mosques of Tashkent, Samarkand, Bukhara, Khiva, and some other Soviet cities in Central Asia, worshippers have revered the memory of the Afghans who fell victim to the shelling of Kabul by

internal opposition militants. The chairman of the religious board of the Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, Mufti Shamsutdinkhan Babakhanov, has said that action not only profaned the holy month of Ramadan, but claimed 11 lives. The mufti pointed out that the crime had been committed when the day of a long-awaited peace had just begun to dawn.

Pakistan Sending Arms to Sri Lankan Muslims

BK0905095888 Moscow International Service in Tamil 1400 GMT 7 May 88

[(Aleksandr Bativ) commentary]

[Text] The Indian minister of state for external affairs, K. Natwar Singh, while speaking in the Rajya Sabha, said the Indian Peacekeeping Force [IPKF] in Sri Lanka has solid evidence that certain elements involved in the ethnic clashes in Sri Lanka's Eastern Province have obtained training in Pakistan. Our commentator (Aleksandr Bativ) writes:

Natwar Singh's statement is further evidence of Pakistan's obvious involvement in the events that are escalating tension in Sri Lanka. For instance, in mid-April, the IPKF seized some arms dumps near Kalmunai city in eastern Sri Lanka which contained Pakistani-made hand grenades. The Muslim extremists had used these grenades and other Pakistani-made weapons in the Muslim-Tamil riots in the Kalmunai area. Seventeen people were killed in those riots. In addition to this, when interrogated, some of the (?detained) Muslim extremists admitted to having undergone training in Pakistan. Those who do not know much about the Sri Lankan situation cannot but be surprised on hearing this. They may ask how Pakistan can have a share in the events in Sri Lanka.

It should be remembered here that certain Islamic fundamentalist circles in Islamabad have been trying, for a long time, to establish close ties with the Sri Lankan Muslims. These efforts were intensified during the years of ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka. At that time, Islamabad started expressing its concern over the plight of Sri Lankan Muslims and began to comply with requests by Sri Lankan Muslim extremists concerning their right to possess arms. The evidence of Pakistan's clandestine supply of arms to the Sri Lankan Muslim extremists and its military training for them (?bear testimony) to Islamabad's policies. Here, we should take note of one thing: We cannot but be suprised at Pakistan's act of availing itself of the right to fulfill the needs of the Sri Lankan Muslims without the knowledge of the Sri Lankan Government itself. Still more surprising is that during the Muslim-Tamil clashes in the Kalmunai area, the LTTE was reported to have used Pakistani-made weapons. It was even more surprising to the Sri Lankan Muslims.

It is known that a large quantity of Pakistani-made weapons were seized by the IPKF after the takeover of the LTTE stronghold in Jaffna. Thus, on the one hand, Islamabad caters to the need of the Sri Lankan Muslims and, on the other, supplies arms to those who attack them. The Indian paper NATIONAL HERALD writes that this is no surprise. Pakistan will have no regrets if its supplying arms escalates tension in Sri Lanka and flares up Muslim-Tamil riots, because Pakistan is not really interested in the welfare of the Sri Lankan Muslims. The paper further says that what Islamabad is interested in is impairing the Indo-Sri Lanka accord and escalating tension in Sri Lanka.

It is also a known fact that there are close contacts between Sri Lankan Tamil extremists and Sikh separatists (?based) in Pakistan. The Sikh extremists are being given military training by the Pakistani intelligence agencies. It should be pointed out here that while speaking at Harvard University in the United States on 8 March 1986, the head of the Coordinating Center of World Sikh Organizations, Retired General G.S. Dhillon, openly pledged support for the Sri Lankan Tamils fighting for an independent government. We cannot ignore the fact that the speech of G.S. Dhillon was arranged at Harvard under the auspices of the U.S. State Department. This Department is clandestinely harboring Sikh separatists based in the United States.

In an interview to the U.S. paper PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD, the popular Sri Lankan public figure, (Peter Keniman), said it is understood that certain circles in Washington do not like the Indo-Sri Lanka accord since it is an obstacle to the military ambitions of the United States in Sri Lanka. Washington uses Pakistan in its efforts to mar this accord. Therefore, the United States continues to supply weapons to Pakistan. (Peter Keniman) further said: Above all, it is true that these arms are being used against Afghanistan and India, but they are also being used in Sri Lanka to escalate tension there.

Western Presence in Gulf Heightens Tension

Soviet Proposals Supported

PM1005145588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 May 88 p 3

[Article by I. Persiyanov under the rubric "Hot Spots: The Persian Gulf": "Still Uneasy"]

[Text] The situation in the Persian Gulf region remains electric. The dividing line between the regional conflict blazing there and its escalation into an international crisis situation is becoming increasingly fine.

The chief cause of the heightened tension persisting there is the continuing Iran-Iraq war. It long ago ceased to be a two-way affair between Iran and Iraq. The war and the resultant instability in the Persian Gulf zone are a subject of heightened concern to the whole world community. International efforts to end it on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 598 are continuing. Unfortunately, it has not yet been possible to secure any compromise in the positions of the sides in the conflict.

The hostilities between Iran and Iraq are not abating. What is more, their armed confrontation is taking increasingly bitter forms. It has gone as far as the massive use of missiles and even chemical weapons.

At the same time, great concern is aroused by Washington's hard line of unilateral strong-arm methods of resolving the problem of "ensuring freedom of shipping" in the Persian Gulf, which are known to have led to direct U.S.-Iranian armed clashes. The U.S. Navy's actions in the gulf against Iran, however people try to substantiate them, bring the situation up to a new level of escalation and create a kind of explosive mix which could reach its critical mass at any moment. The situation is also being exacerbated as a consequence of the recent sharp increase in tension in Tehran's relations with Arab states of the Persian Gulf, particularly Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. This is confirmed, inter alia, by Riyadh's announcement of the severing of diplomatic relations with Iran. On the whole, all this seems to harbor a threat that new states will be drawn into the quagmire of the Iran-Iraq conflict.

In the extreme situation which is taking shape, it is extremely important to block the dangerous development of the situation and give a fresh boost to the efforts to settle the conflict. The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that only political means can untie this complex knot. The arguments of weapons must finally give way to the weapon of arguments. The gamble on diplomacy of force is plainly a subject from the past of international relations.

The start of a settlement depends, above all, on the belligerents themselves. But it is also clear that it is hardly possible to move in the direction of peace and security in the Persian Gulf region without mobilizing the efforts of the entire world community and coordinating actions at the United Nations. In the Soviet Union's opinion, the relaxation of tension there should be approached from several directions. The chief of these are the activation of the UN secretary general's mission to fulfill UN Security Council Resolution 598 and the withdrawal of the nonlittoral states' naval forces from the gulf zone. These forces must be replaced by corresponding UN naval contingents. The international conference on merchant shipping held in Bombay this spring came out in favor of the Soviet proposals for a cardinal reduction of foreign naval forces in the Persian Gulf and in favor of placing under UN auspices the ensuring of freedom of peaceful shipping there. It is important to emphasize that the realization of these specific proposals would undoubtedly help also to resolve an extremely urgent task of an international nature—the reduction of naval activity on seas and oceans.

The United States, which is continuing to emphasize the diplomacy of force, is not only doing all it can to uphold the preservation of its massive naval presence in the gulf zone, but is working in practice to expand the U.S. Navy's mission. Washington's decision in this regard, which is supported by its NATO allies, attests to the administration's intention to consolidate the U.S. military presence there and to extend the North Atlantic bloc's sphere of operations to it. I believe that this approach will in no way lead to the restoration of military-political stability in the Persian Gulf or help to ensure the security of freedom of shipping there. It leads, as the facts show, to increased confrontation and more military clashes. According to data from the U.S. Center for Defense Information, during the period from July 1987, that is, the time of the sharp U.S. naval buildup in the Persian Gulf, through April this year the number of clashes almost doubled compared with 1986-1987. This is also attested by the recent incident involving the U.S. frigate "Samuel Roberts." Its encounter with a mine entailed the first large-scale U.S.-Iranian hostilities in the Persian Gulf since the start of the Iran-Iraq war.

The political consequences of such actions are very dangerous for the region. See what kind of chain reaction there is: The conference of WEU foreign and defense ministers held in The Hague in April adopted a decision not to reduce the scale of the military presence of this organization's countries in the Persian Gulf; the Danish-Belgian minesweeping fleet under British command resumed its activities; a decision was adopted to extend cooperation there between the navies of the United States and its NATO allies.

The incident involving the U.S. frigate and the U.S.-Iranian missile clash confirmed once again that the massive foreign military presence in the Gulf zone (something like 60 warships are now concentrated there) is fraught with the danger that the situation could get out of control and become totally unpredictable.

'Militarists' Send Chemical Arms

NC1105102988 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1800 GMT 10 May 88

[Unattributed commentary: "The Western Militarists Are Paving the Way Toward the Use of Chemical Weapons in the Iran-Iraq War"]

[Text] Dear friends, the UN committee studying the use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war recently submitted a report to the Security Council. The committee pointed with great concern to the intensification of the use of this piratical weapon which has led to an increase in the number of victims, both military and civilian. Also, in a unanimously approved resolution, the UN Security Council has condemned the use of chemical weapons.

It should be pointed out that from its very onset, the Iran-Iraq war acquired a criminal and piratical nature. It was less than a year after the outbreak that signs were seen of the use of biological weapons. Ahvaz in Iran and Hajj 'Umran in Iraq were named in relation with this. This year, too, a similar crime led to the deaths of thousands in Halabjah.

At three different times the United Nations has carried out special research on chemical weapons use. Two years ago the UN committee put forth indubitable evidence proving the use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war.

The world public is becoming increasingly aware of who has put this piratical weapon into the hands of the two warring sides. As far back as 4 years ago, Washington's representative announced that the FRG and a number of other West European countries, as well as Japan, were sending to Iran and Iraq chemicals which could be used as bological arms, and 2 years ago it was revealed that the FRG company (Fritz Werner) was supplying equipment needed to manufacture chemical weapons.

While pocketing profits through a filthy trade, the imperialist companies are actually creating the necessary conditions for the expansion of an extensive chemical war between Iran and Iraq. The Western press publishes reports on the construction of units for manufacturing poisonous materials in Iraq, a project which FRG companies have undertaken. Meanwhile, Britain's OBSERVER pointed out that Iran, too, has started manufacturing chemical weapons in the city of Damghan. The newspaper also reported that missiles which can fire paralyzing chemicals have been tested. FRG companies especially are persistently encouraging the propagation of chemical weapons. This has gone so far that last month, the Darmstadt public prosecutor had to start investigations on the case of 12 FRG industrial companies accused of sending parts for chemical weapons to Iraq. The documents presented to the court showed that [name indistinct], (Karl Kohl), and a number of other companies participated in the construction of industrial units which manufacture materials needed for the production of chemical (?warheads) in Iraq.

Meanwhile, while fanning the flames of the chemical war between Iran and Iraq, Western militaristic circles are trying to blame others for what they are doing. They constantly accuse the Soviet Union. For example, the Pentagon submitted a special report as far back as 4 years ago in which it baselessly tried to accuse the Soviet Union of sending chemical weapons to the warring sides in the Iran-Iraq war. At that time, Turkey's GUNES as well as IRNA picked up and repeated this lie. However, it should be pointed out that the Soviet Union's principled stand on matters concerning chemical weapons is clear to everyone. The Soviet Union has supplied no one with chemical weapons or the technology and equipment needed to manufacture chemical weapons. Our country decisively supports the complete ban on chemical weapons and the destruction of their reserves under strict international control. Nevertheless, efforts to accuse and slander Soviet policy do not stop. Recently, FRG's FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU published slanderous reports on the Soviet Union's participation in supplying Iraq with chemical weapons. In a brief news conference in Moscow, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov completely refuted these allegations, pointing out that none of the chemicals that can be used to manufacture chemical weapons have been sent to Iraq or Iran. He also stated that the Soviet Union condemns and will always condemn the use of chemical weapons under any conditions.

Using such piratical means as chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war once again points to the persistent need for an immediate halt to the war. UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar condemned the use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war and called on the warring sides to respond to UN efforts aimed toward a just and all-embracing solution of this war through the full implementation of Resolution 598. Perez de Cuellar pointed out that in the final analysis, this resolution is the only way to end the people's horrific deaths and sufferings, which stem from, among other things, the continued use of chemical weapons.

Social Factors in Islamic Revival Analyzed

PM1005140188 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 88 p 3

[Article by Yu. Sedov under the rubric "From KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA File": "Under the Green Banner. Islamic Groupings Now Becoming Increasingly Active in the Near East"]

[Text] ...The first prayers are at 0500 hours in Muslim countries. A cry shatters the night air. "Allah Akbar!" ("Allah is great!"), amplified by loudspeakers, resounds from thousands upon thousands of mosques. Cities and people wake up. Most women appearing in the streets wear scarves covering their neck, ears and hair—a sign of their adherence to Islamic traditions. You also encounter women increasingly often who are completely enveloped in dark, sacklike clothing.

The first thing which impresses foreigners in any Muslim country is the multitude of mosques, ancient and modern, crammed with believers on Fridays. At stadiums you often see young people playing soccer in their long, wide trousers. They interrupt their game not only when the referee blows his whistle, but when they hear the voice of the muezzin from the neighboring mosque, kneel down "facing Mecca," and say their prayers. In some universities every lecture is given twice—for men and for women separately.

Such scenes are typical in Muslim everyday life. But today Islam is obtruding into politics increasingly actively. What are the reasons for the phenomenon now often called the "Islamic revival"? Is it only the effect of the Iranian revolution, as the Western press sometimes says?

This revolution carried out under religious slogans swept away the shah's regime, which had been thought to be imperialism's firmest bastion in the region, and was certainly a powerful stimulus in strengthening Islamic

sentiments in the Arab countries. But today the revolution in Iran has lost its attraction for most Muslims because of the militant extremism of the Khomeyni regime's policy and its refusal to stop the Iran-Iraq war, which is having a catastrophic effect on the Arab and the entire Muslim world. But in reality the "Islamic boom" began to emerge, and quite rapidly, long before the events in Iran in the late 1970's.

Religion actively infiltrates sociopolitical life, as a rule, at turning points in a society's development. When it comes to Muslim countries, the traditionally high level of religious observance among the population there is often nothing other than an attempt to get away from socioeconomic and political problems that are always acute. Contrary to expectations, decolonization and the winning of political independence in the 1960's and 1970's did not in themselves lead to rapid prosperity. Moreover, the gap in levels of economic development between the industrialized states and the "Third World" countries invariably grew. The revolution of rising expectations began to change into a reaction of disappointed hopes, wrote the famous Egyptian journalist M. Haykal. There emerged a difficult situation characterized by a crisis in the ideology of the petty bourgeois leadership which had headed the liberation struggle in most of the developing countries and frequently turned out to be incapable of vindicating the masses' hopes. There arose a kind of ideological vacuum which, given the extremely high degree of religious feeling among the population, Islam easily began to fill.

The "6-Day War" in 1967, in which the Arab countries suffered great territorial, economic, and human losses, was a kind of catalyst for a surge in religious sentiments in the Arab countries. The Israelis occupied the eastern part of Jerusalem, where certain Islamic holy places and Muslim relics are located.

Under these conditions many people in the Arab countries saw the path to regaining national dignity and satisfying national pride as lying in a return to "true" belief in Allah. Many Muslims attribute their prosperity in the Middle Ages to "genuine Islam." Inasmuch as Islam postulated certain egalitarian principles typical of tribal relations in Arab societies at that time, it is associated in the eyes of ordinary people with equality and social justice to this day. Hence the increase in the Islamicization of sociopolitical life, mainly in the spirit of early Islam, and the revival of fundamentalism—the movement for a return to the sources of the prophet Muhammad's teaching. So the objective process of Islamicization gathered strength, welling up from "below." The revolution in Iran also served as a powerful stimulus to its development.

The leaders of the Arab countries could not ignore the realities stemming from the high degree of religious consciousness among the masses. But while, for example, former Egyptian President Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir actively utilized "popular Islam" as an ideological instrument to mobilize the Egyptians to struggle against Israel and to resolve socioeconomic problems, President A. al-Sadat, his successor in power in Egypt, resorted to manipulating Islamic concepts with the aim of disguising the anti-Arab essence of his regime's separate deal with Israel and rapprochement with U.S. imperialism. The fact that Islam was also quite an effective tool in the hands of the opposition during both Al-Nasir's and Al-Sadat's time may seem no less paradoxical. A similar picture can also be observed in the other Arab countries. Such is the ambivalent, contradictory character of the steadily growing process of the politicization of Islam and the Islamicization of politics in the Near and Middle East. Historical experience testifies that a liberation struggle can unfold under the green banner of Islam. But reaction also successfully uses Islamic slogans.

The period of Al-Sadat's rule and his policy are an example of how Islamicization "from above" is actively utilized for anti-people purposes. Al-Sadat's attitude to religion was determined, above all, by sociopolitical motives according with the interests of the bourgeoisie and the Western monopolies. In encouraging Islam for the struggle against left-wing forces, he obviously underestimated the possible consequences of his policy and, essentially, let the jinni out of the bottle. In the end, he sowed the wind and reaped a whirlwind: The Muslim extremists made short work of him, staging a bloody slaughter during a military parade in Cairo in 1981.

The present Egyptian president, Mubarak, taking into account the experience of his predecessor, apparently aims to maintain a balance in relations with the formally banned "Muslim Brotherhood," which represents the moderate religious opposition.

At the same time, Muslim extremist groupings which are extensively exploiting the country's difficult economic position and the absence of progress in a Near East settlement are becoming more active. They advocate violent methods, destroy casinos, video clubs, and wine stores, demand separate education for boys and girls, and demand polygamy. There are increasingly loud calls in the mosques for a "return to primordial Islam." Although the government controls the situation in the country, the unabated activity of the Islamic extremists is causing it noticeable concern.

In Egypt, as in other Arab countries, fundamentalism is most widespread among students. An opinion poll conducted in mid-1987 at Cairo and Helwan Universities showed that 83 percent of those questioned believe that the introduction in the country of the sharia—the code of Islamic laws—is the best way to attain social justice. At first glance, this fact may seem paradoxical: This is the most educated, urbanized section of society and is less bound by the ties of the old family clans. Later, however, it turned out that it was almost exclusively students originating from poor families who were in favor of introducing the sharia. The survey also showed that only one in three students hopes to get suitable work

after completing his studies, and only one in five to be able to maintain a family independently. Add to this the growing sense of humiliation every Arab feels regarding the inability to recover the territories occupied by Israel. What a fertile field for fundamentalist activity!

Favorable conditions have been created for the spread of Islamic sentiments in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories, where the popular uprising has been raging for 5 months now.

Since Islamic activity on the West Bank and in Gaza in recent years was directed not so much against Israel as against "unbelieving" left-wing forces among the Palestinians, the occupying powers encouraged it. As a result, the fundamentalists enjoyed opportunities to propagandize their religious views.

Moreover, more than 70 percent of these lands' population is less than 20 years old. That is, the same young people who, given their high religious consciousness, their humiliating status under the occupation regime, and the absence of prospects for a Near East settlement, show a particular tendency toward maximalism in an Islamic spirit. What can be offered to a generation which has never experienced freedom and which has, in essence, only one prospect—becoming a low-paid work force for the dirtiest jobs in Israel?

Today, however, the Palestinian struggle has acquired qualitatively new characteristics. One of them is that from an ideological standpoint, the uprising has been brought about equally by Palestinian nationalism and Islamic fundamentalism. The leaflets circulated in the occupied territories often contain calls for national liberation alongside calls for Islamic revolution. Striving to split the PLO and the advocates of Islam, the Israeli special services disseminate false documents allegedly from the "Muslim resistance" calling for a halt to the uprising. At the same time, in the name of "Palestinian communists," the special services disseminate material attacking religious organizations.

On the whole, events of the last 15-20 years in the Muslim East testify that the increase in believers' religious fervor is merely the outward manifestation of sociopolitical tendencies which have been given an Islamic complexion and may have a substantial influence on the situation's development both in individual countries and in entire regions.

New Israeli 'Aggressive Actions' Analyzed

PM1005133988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 May 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Konstantin Geyvandov "Political Observer's Opinion": "Israel Expanding Aggression"]

[Text] Yes, Israel is once again broadening the scale of aggression against Lebanon. At the beginning of this month, Israeli troops in great strength invaded deep inside Lebanese territory. The operation was backed by mass artillery shelling and steady fire support by combat helicopters. Official Tel Aviv tried to calm representatives of Western mass media with assurances that this was supposedly a "limited" and even "defensive" action.

But Israel's Defense Minister, Y. Rabin, upon arrival in the captured area of South Lebanon, threatened that his military are unhesitatingly determined to carry out similar operations against this sovereign Arab state. I am inclined to believe him since, in this context, one immediately recalls June 1982 when, starting with a similar "defensive" operation, the Israeli occupiers ended up in West Beirut. It is perfectly feasible that this could be repeated now, taking into account the timing of the latest act of Israeli aggression and the result of an investigation of the latent causes which have brought it about.

I would provisionally divide these causes into three groups: domestic, external, and international. I say provisionally because they are closely interlinked, and at times it is simply impossible to identify the line where one ends and the next begins, or to decide in which category to class it. Nonetheless, let us try to look into the matter.

One group of causes, provisionally classed as domestic, is linked with the uprising by Palestinians in the occupied West Bank of the River Jordan and Gaza Strip, which is in its fifth month now. From the viewpoint of the current Israeli Government, these territories are seen as belonging to Israel. Moreover, the Tel Aviv leaders are evidently not at all perturbed by the fact that half of the population of the state which is thus formed is openly hostile to the other half. The uprising by 1.5 million Palestinian Arabs in the occupied territories, supported by 700,000 Arabs inside Israel, leaves no doubts at all on this account.

And so, Y. Shamir's government was faced with the question: What is to be done? On the one hand, the Palestinians, even though unarmed, had risen up against the occupation authorities and, according to the canons of fanatical Zionists, they had to be dealt with in the most merciless fashion—which, incidentally, is being done. On the other hand, however, would it not be too much of a risk to bring down upon them your entire military might (air force bombing raids, missile and artillery shelling) if the events are taking place in a territory which you have annexed or are intending to annex? One must also add to this the growing desire among many Israelis for a just political settlement of the Palestinian problem and the Near East crisis as a whole.

Taking all this into account, it can be confidently asserted that the Israeli Army's latest aggressive action against Lebanon was conceived as a demonstration of the Shamir government's military might, of its, so to speak, hardline and unwavering intention to continue banking on armed strength in everything. At the same time, this action must evidently be perceived as a kind of

warning to Arab neighbors that they should not take Tel Aviv's surprising inability to cope with the armed uprising in the occupied Arab lands as evidence of what Britain's THE DAILY TELEGRAPH called weakness and lack of resolve.

It is easy to see that, at this point, this group of causes provisionally classed as domestic begins to cross over into another group of causes classed as external. And, apart from threats and demonstrations of military might, you can discern the outlines of a highly specific objective. The point is that presidential elections are scheduled to be held in Lebanon this summer. In conditions of continuing civil war and Israeli occupation of part of Lebanon's territory, the nation's healthy forces naturally link this important event with hopes to restore peace and security in the country and its territorial integrity and sovereignty on the basis of the pressing process of democratic transformations of society.

But such a development of events does not suit Tel Aviv and Washington. This was demonstrated with the utmost clarity in 1982, when Israel launched war against Lebanon with the United States' blessing. And it has to be said that it achieved its goal in terms of the domestic crisis in Lebanon, postponing its solution and national reconciliation in the country by virtually another 6 years. Therefore, when Israel's Defense Minister Rabin now issues threats about new raids by his military against Lebanon, his threats ought not to be underestimated. I would not rule out a repetition of the summer of 1982.

Finally, the international aspect. Israel's latest aggressive raid against a neighboring Arab state followed right after the latest flareup of acute tension in the Persian Gulf caused by the U.S. Armed Forces. Using what I consider to be an extremely unconvincing pretext, the Pentagon ordered its Navy to launch full-scale military operations against Iran. How are these facts to be assessed? What is this—an accidental coincidence or a confirmation of the old truth that what Washington says goes in Tel Aviv? The latter, I would rather think, and this "says-goes" produces an escalation rather than creating a favorable atmosphere for the peaceful settlement of the two dangerous conflicts in the region.

Thus, Iranian Prime Minister M.H. Musavi has already threatened: "The Persian Gulf will become another Vietnam for the United States. We will not leave unanswered a single hostile action by the United States and will deal a crushing blow to the Americans." And people in Washington, recalling the tragic events in 1980, must know that such statements are no bluff. On the other hand, can anyone take really seriously the U.S. calls to impose an embargo on arms deliveries to Iran because of its refusal to obey UN Security Council Resolution 598 after the Pentagon has time and again used armed force against it?

But we are witnessing a qualitatively new phenomenon in the case of Israel's aggressive actions. They are encountering a resolute rebuff with all the ensuing consequences. For example, the Israeli Army, having encountered armed resistance and suffered loss of life, has been forced to curtail the latest operation against southern Lebanon. Let alone the fact that the Palestinian uprising in the occupied West Bank of the River Jordan and Gaza Strip is continuing despite all efforts by the Israelis to put it down.

If there is a conclusion to be drawn from this situation, it ought to be this: The policy of "faits accomplis", which the United States and Israel have been trying to pursue in the Near East over the last few decades, has proved to be totally inconsistent and unacceptable. It has not and is not likely to bring either peace or security to the region. This truth is now realized by virtually the entire world community, which decisively supports, for example, the need for an all-embracing political settlement of the Arab-Israeli crisis by means of convening an international conference. Now it is only up to the United States and Israel.

Sub-Saharan Africa

London Talks on Southern Africa Summarized

LD1005112688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] The withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola was not discussed at the meeting in London on problems relating to settling the situation in Southern Africa, Angolan Foreign Minister Afonso Van Dunem, who led the Angolan delegation at this meeting, has told journalists. Here is a Mayak commentary with Nadezhda Ryasova at the microphone:

[Ryasova] The meeting in London a week ago aroused the interest of all those who follow events in international life. For the first time, delegations from Angola, Cuba, the RSA, and the United States sat down at the negotiating table to discuss ways for a settlement in southern Africa. The chief issues were matters connected with martial law in Angola and the granting of independence to Namibia. The very fact that these talks are being conducted is being regarded positively as a step toward resolving one of the most acute regional conflicts on earth. According to Chester Crocker, U.S. assistant secretary for African affairs, who led the U.S. delegation, the Soviet-U.S. dialogue promoted the convening of this meeting.

The Angolan Government has shown good will in embarking on direct contacts with the RSA. The Angolan and Cuban delegations have proposed for the sake of compromise a quite realistic draft of a quadripartite treaty between Angola, Cuba, the RSA, and the South-West African People's Organization, SWAPO, which is leading Namibia's struggle for independence. This treaty would ensure Angola's security, the establishment of

peace between it and the RSA, and the decolonization of Namibia. For this to take place, it is necessary for both the RSA and the United States to halt all interference in Angola's internal affairs and not give any aid to the terrorist gangs of UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], operating against the legitimate Angolan Government, and of course UN Security Council Resolution 435 on Namibia should be implemented. But both Washington and Pretoria continue to adhere to an unconstructive stance on these fundamental issues. Crocker stated that Washington's relations with UNITA are not subject to discussion, and together with the South African delegation he insisted on an artificial linkage between the issue of Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of the Cuban contingent from Angola. The stance of the People's Republic of Angola on this issue has not changed. They resolutely reject this far-fetched linkage, so the positions of the sides on the problems under discussion still differ.

But the important thing is that all those taking part in the London talks have agreed to meet again soon in an African country.

East Europe

Gdansk Shipyard 'Illegal Demonstration' Ends

LD1005204988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2039 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Warsaw, 10 May (TASS)—According to a PAP agency report, the participants in the illegal strike at Gdansk shipyard left the area of the enterprise at 2000 local time today. Thus, an end has been put to this illegal demonstration in which a section of the personnel of this enterprise participated.

Emergency Powers Discussed

LD1005193788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] [Announcer Pavel Kasparov] The beginning of this week in Poland was marked by a normal pace of work at industrial enterprises, including the metallurgical combine in Krakow. The exception so far is only the protracted conflict at the Gdansk shipyard. Listen to a report from our correspondent Vasiliy Lesovik:

[Lesovik] In accordance with a decision by the management and in view of the impossibility of the enterprise functioning normally, the shipyard has stopped work. Workers have been given leave. The number of participants in this illegal so-called wildcat strike has fallen by half but, as before, they are rejecting all the administration's proposals and compromises aimed at settling the conflict.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that economic claims for the participants in this strike, that is with Mr Walesa at its head, are not the basis for this conflict. Wages at the shipyard were already significantly higher than in other branches and on average throughout the country. The gamble is being taken on political adventurism, which has nothing in common with the interests of the Polish workers. The protracted standstill at the shipyard is leading to the economic bankruptcy of the enterprise, which already has an acute deficit. The National Bank and the Finance Ministry have examined the request by management and the Industry Ministry for more credit in view of the enterprise's insolvency and its worsening financial situation. They refused such credit.

Tomorrow, 11 May, a session of the Polish Sejm will be held in Warsaw. A draft law has been tabled for examination by the deputies about granting the government emergency powers to radically accelerate the implementation of the program of the second stage of economic reform. Work on this draft law was begun after Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, in March of this year, announced the possibility of such measures being adopted if the results of the 1st quarter reflected a strengthening of processes slowing down reform. The sociopolitical situation in the country during the past 2 months has already confirmed the need for these problems to be radically solved.

The draft law contains a number of decisions aimed at speeding up a balancing of the economy, providing opportunities for the full implementation of the second stage of the economic reform, and in particular, countering the excessive increases in prices and wages, the acceleration of the growth of inflation, and the acceleration of negative phenomena standing in the way of the independent enterprising approach and self-financing of enterprises. The draft law also envisions the adoption of firmer economic sanctions (?against) the activity of enterprises running a loss.

[Kasparov] So, let me remind you that tomorrow the Polish Sejm will meet in Warsaw, and if it grants the Council of Ministers emergency powers, then within the framework of this temporary law, the economic future of a number of loss-making enterprises, including the Polish shipyard in Gdansk where the strike is continuing, may look altogether problematic.

Western Forces 'Manipulating' Polish Strikes

PM1005151788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov report: "Poland: Manipulation"—boldface as published]

[Text] Warsaw—C. Tolwinski, director of the Gdansk shipyards, has made the following statement: "The management's terms for ending the strike, terms advantageous to those taking part in the strike, have been rejected. It is with regret that I inform you that in the shipyard's current financial and material situation which is aggravated still further by the stoppages, the continued allocation of credits and grants to us by the Polish

National Bank and the Ministry of Finance has become impossible. In view of all this I have asked the Ministry of Industry to come to a decision on the shipyard's future."

Thus, as a result of the strike, the Gdansk shipyard—the enterprise which was Poland's pride for decades and well known throughout the world—has been brought to the brink of bankruptcy. The strike organizers have achieved their goal: The republic's economy has been caused considerable harm. In the heat of the struggle and seeking revenge against the socialist state for the defeat in 1981, they have "forgotten," however, the thousands of workers and their families whose well-being depends on the yard's normal activity.

Yes, the antisocialist forces place their own political ambitions above all else. They are taking an anti-people course because they know that they have a chance to profit well from the disorders and to curry favor with their Western bosses and paymasters. The bourgeois mass media, in particular the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, is currently reporting details of the Gdansk shipyard strike's beginning, which are unknown to the Polish public:

"On the morning of Monday, 2 May, the black Mercedes of Father Jankowski, priest of St Brygida's and a friend and adviser of L. Walesa, went in through the gates of the Number 3 yard, which had been taken over by the strikers, and entered the enterprise's territory. From the trunk of the car he took some Western-made bullhorns and, after a short prayer, issued them to the strike ringleaders. 'You are the masters here now,' the priest said, 'behave appropriately and remember that the world is watching you'."

Those strikers who remain reject every initiative issuing from the shipyard leadership and from the local authorities and are abusing their good will. A political game is in progress, one which Poles do not need but which is so necessary to the anti-Polish forces in the West. It is important for those forces to have a pretext to impede the development of the West's further economic cooperation with Poland and to block credits to it.

There is only one hopeful factor: Each day the occupying group is diminishing. The workers embroiled in this adventure are going home; they are sick of being used as puppets in the hands of people who are in the pay of the West.

The Gdansk shipyard is now the only remaining hotbed of strikes. This trend worries the Western orchestrators of the Polish disorders. As usual they are now resorting to primitive deception. AFP is spreading the rumor that there is a strike involving 25,000 workers at the Ursus tractor works in Warsaw. The fabrication is immediately taken up by other Western news agencies. It turns out that there is no strike at all. But it was necessary to fuel those rumors so that Walesa could give an interview and say that Warsaw is also now supporting the Gdansk strikers.

Thus, certain forces in the West are manipulating events in Poland. This is not being done to serve the interests of the Polish people at all. Rather, it is to hinder the processes of the economic reform and the democratization of sociopolitical life under way in Poland.

PZPR Politburo Examines Bilateral Relations

LD1105055588 Moscow TASS in English 0545 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Warsaw May 11 TASS—At its regular meeting Tuesday the Political Bureau of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP) Central Committee noted that the accomplishments of an experience in implementing the declaration on Soviet-Polish cooperation in the field of ideology, science and culture confirm the importance and relevance of the guidelines in the work and the foremost tasks in developing friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Poland. The essence of these tasks in developing friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Poland. The essense of these tasks is closely related to the fulfillment of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tenth PUWP Congress.

The Politburo heard the information on progress in translating into action the provisions of the declaration and implementing the comprehensive programme of strengthening and developing relations between the USSR and PUWP.

The Politburo analyzed the socio-political and economic situation in the country and the way the reforms of the state and the economy were enacted. It recognized the necessity to expedite and translate into life more vigorously the decisions aimed at deepening democratic transformations, expanding the sphere in which to display initiative and social activeness, and developing national concord.

The process to introduce the economic reform, which takes place in unusually difficult conditions, should be the subject of constant and thorough analysis, which would take into account, in part, the social consequences of the changes enacted.

The Politburo heard the results of the discussion of the draft law on granting emergency powers to the government and stressed that they should serve to defend the working people's living standards and to realize in its entirety the second stage of the economic reform.

Further on Gromyko Delegation's Romania Visit

Moscow Departure Detailed

PM1105120988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading: "On Official Visit"]

[Text] A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, left Moscow for Bucharest 10 May on an official friendly visit at the invitation of N. Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and Socialist Republic of Romania president. The official accompanying party includes G.G. Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.I. Kamshalov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography; M.V. Gramov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport; Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister; A.N. Ivoditov, USSR deputy minister of ferrous metallurgy; V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union; and V.V. Zhurkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute.

At the airport A.A. Gromyko was seen off by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Ya.Ya. Vagris, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; L.N. Tolkunov and A.E. Voss, chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.F. Rubtsov, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretariat; USSR Minister A.N. Volkov; I.S. Nayashkov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries; USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.P. Aboimov, and other officials.

N. Stanea, Romanian charge d'affaires ad interim to the USSR, was among the send-off party.

Ceremony Greets Delegation

LD1005162988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0950 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Bucharest, 10 May (TASS)—Andrey Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, arrived in Bucharest today on an official friendly visit.

The national flags of the USSR and Romania were raised on the tarmac at Bucharest's Otopeni Airport. The honor guard of the Romanian Armed Forces was lined up in precise formation.

At 1100 the Soviet airliner with the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium aboard landed and slowly taxied to the airport terminal. Its nose was covered with welcoming banners in Russian and Romanian.

By the plane steps N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and Romanian president, and his wife exchanged friendly handhakes with A.A. Gromyko and his wife.

Romanian and Soviet pioneers presented A.A. Gromyko and the officials accompanying him with bunches of scarlet carnations.

On this sunny, warm, summery May Day, Romanian party and state officials, representatives of the town's working people, and Soviet diplomats gathered at the airport to welcome the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

M. Manescu, Executive Political Committee member of the RCP Central Committee, vice president of the Romanian State Council, and other officials were introduced to A.A. Gromyko.

Among the welcoming party was Ye.M. Tyazhelnikov, USSR Ambassador to Romania.

The Soviet and Romanian national anthems sounded out solemnly over the airfield. The echo of a 21-gun salute resounded.

The leader of the honor guard reported to the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A.A. Gromyko and N. Ceaucescu reviewed the Romanian troops. The meeting ceremony concluded with a march past by the honor guard.

A cortege of vehicles carrying the Soviet guests and Romanian officials accompanied by a motorcycle escort of honor left the airfield and headed for town. Bright banners glorifying Soviet-Romanian friendship hung in the town's squares and streets, swathed in the many spring colors of southern trees and bushes. Hundreds of state flags of the two countries fluttered rhythmically from flagpoles.

On the same day A.A. Gromyko visited sacred places in the Romanian capital.

In the Park of Freedom, he laid a wreath at the eternal flame by the Pantheon, raised to the memory of the best sons of the Romanian people who gave their lives for their country's bright future.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium paid a tribute of profound reverence to the Soviet servicemen who fell in battle during the liberation of Romania from Hitlerite Fascism. He lais a wreath on the monument raised in their honor in one of the city squares.

A solemn wreath laying ceremony was held at the monument to V.I. Lenin, great leader of the worldwide proletariat.

As the wreaths were laid, the Romanian honor guards line up and the two countries' national anthems were played.

Talks With Ceausescu

LD1005230088 Moscow TASS in English 2220 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Bucharest May 11 TASS—The friendly relationship between the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Romania is getting ever closer, with active contacts maintained at every level.

This observation has been made in the course of talks which opened here Tuesday between Andrey Gromyko, a CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and president of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Nicolae Ceausescu, Romanian Communist Party general secretary and president of Romania.

Gromyko said that the consistent fulfillment of understandings reached at meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ceausescu should help increase the effectiveness of bilateral cooperation in political, economic, cultural, and other fields.

In this connection empahsis was made on practical efforts to tackle common tasks and harmoniously develop every aspect of Soviet-Romanian relations.

Ceausescu said that the Soviet Union's achievements are thought highly of in Romania. Over a short time the USSR has become a great industrial power, he noted, pointing also to the high appreciation in this country for what he described as the exceptional role played by the Soviet Union and the war against Nazism and in its routing.

"We do not understand those attempting to put these facts in doubt," Ceausescu continued.

"The Soviet people have demonstrated that they have made their once backward country into a great power. For many indicators, it now occupies first place in the world.

"Could it have been possible, for example, to break through into space without advanced science and engineering? All of your achievements evoke a very broad response in the world," Ceausescu said.

Gromyko replied that he accepts these words with satisfaction. "Neither we nor history will allow our achievements to be belittled," he said.

The talks, which were marked by an atmosphere of friendship, cordiality and mutual understanding, will be continued.

Presents Order to Ceausescu

PM1105133988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 1988 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Presentation of Soviet Order"]

[Text] Bucharest, 10 May—A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, presented the Order of Lenin to N. Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, in the State Council palace of the Socialist Republic of Romania today.

Presenting the award, A.A. Gromyko said:

Dear Comrade Ceausescu!

Dear comrades!

I am fulfilling a pleasant and honored mission on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It consists of presenting to you, Comrade General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Order of Lenin which you have been awarded for services in developing fraternal friendship and cooperation between the Romanian and Soviet peoples. From your early years you, Comrade Ceausescu, have linked your entire life and career with the Communist and workers' movement, the leading force of social progress of our epoch. The courageous struggle of Romanian Communists for the interests of the working class and the entire working people of the country is memorable for us, as is the international solidarity of the best sons and daughters of Romania with the party of Lenin and with revolutionary October.

Clearly written in the chronicle of our joint history are the comradeship-in-arms in the rout of fascism, and the fraternal alliance and comradely mutual assistance over the course of more than four decades of the construction of a new society.

Conferring upon you the lofty Soviet order bearing the name of the founder of the world's first socialist state, which state has from the very first days of its existence followed the course of peace and friendship of peoples, is recognition of your great contribution to the cause of constant strengthening of Soviet-Romanian relations and all-around cooperation between the Soviet Union and Romania.

The feelings of deep sympathy and respect which the Soviet people have for the friendly Romanian people, comrades in struggle and creative labor, are expressed in this award. It symbolizes the will of the Communists and all the working people of the Soviet Union, together with

the Romanian Communists and the working people of socialist Romania, to multiply the glorious traditions of our friendship and of broad many-sided interaction for the good of socialism.

Romania's desire not to rest on what it has achieved but to consistently elevate the level of our relations is highly appreciated in the Soviet Union. For our part, we are fully determined to do everything to ensure that the development of our ties opens up new horizons of fruitful mutually advantageous coperation and continues to fully meet with the basic interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Romania and the interests of consolidating the positions of world socialism.

The accords reached during the meetings and talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and yourself, Comrade Ceausescu, serve as reliable pointers to joint work in this direction.

The Soviet Union and Romania, together with the other socialist countries, are in the vanguard of the struggle for peace, universal security, and cooperation in the international arena.

Motivated by a feeling of responsibility for the destiny of mankind, our parties are pursuing a course toward reaffirming a new political thinking. Their aim is to achieve a fundamental change for the better in international affairs and to create an all-embracing system of peace and security.

Permit me to wish you, dear Comrade Ceausescu, good health and success in your work for the benefit of socialist Romania, the strengthening of Soviet-Romanian relations and friendship, and cooperation between all the socialist countries in the struggle for peace and social progress.

N. Ceausescu made a speech in reply. He said:

Dear Comrade Gromyko!

Dear comrades!

I would like to express the warmest gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee and to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for the award and presentation of the lofty order bearing the name of Lenin, the leader of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the founder of the first socialist state of workers and peasants. I value the presentation of this order as high appraisal of the activity I have conducted and continue to conduct in the ranks of the RCP and in the revolutionary movement of our country for social and national liberation, for the construction of socialism in Romania and, first and foremost, high appraisal of the policy of our Communist Party in socialist construction, of its contribution to the development of cooperation and friendship between our countries, parties, and peoples and to the cause of socialism and peace throughout the world.

Long-established and traditional realtions of friendship and cooperation, and of solidarity in the common struggle against exploitation and oppression, and for freedom and a better life, exist between Romania and the Soviet Union and between the peoples of our countries. The participation of brigades of Romanian revolutionaries in the struggle to defend the socialist revolution and the young Soviet state was a reflection of this solidarity. At the concluding stage of World War II, the Romanian Army and the Soviet Army fought shoulder to shoulder against fascism right up to the final victory. This raised fraternal cooperation between our peoples to a new level. During the years of socialist construction these relations have assuemd new dimensions, being firmly founded on the principles of full equality and mutual respect, and upon the noble principles and ideals of socialism. I stress on this occasion the special contribution made to the development of Romanian-Soviet relations by the summit meetings and especially the negotiations and accords reached last year with Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, and by the fresh prospects which have opened up for development of friendship and cooperation between our parties and peoples.

I am convinced that your current visit to Romania will be a new and important moment in the chronicle of Romanian-Soviet friendship in the sphere of both bilateral ties and of more active interaction in the world arena, together with the other socialist countries, to resolve the major problems confronting our epoch—disarmament, peace, and the creation of a better and more just world.

The RCP Central Committee, the State Council, the government, and I personally will continue to do everything to ensure the uninterrupted development of Romanian-Soviet friendship and cooperation and solidarity between our Communist parties in the interests of both peoples and of the cause of socialism and peace worldwide.

I will take this opportunity of sending to the Communists and the peoples of the Soviet Union wishes for increasingly bigger achievements in fulfilling the programs of socialist building, progress, and prosperity, and I wish you success in all your activity and very good health.

The presentation was attended, on the Romanian side, by C. Dascalescu, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and Romanian prime minister, and other party and state leaders; and

On the Soviet side, by the officials accompanying the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman on his trip.

Yazov Greets CSSR Defense Minister on Jubilee

PM1105102188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Defense Minister Army General D.Yazov message of congratulations to CSSR National Defense Minister Army General Comrade M. Vaslavik]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Minister!

To mark the national holiday—the 43d anniversary of the completion of the Czechoslovak people's national liberation struggle and the liberation of Czechoslovakia from the fascist invaders—I send you and all the servicemen of the Czechoslovak People's Army fraternal greetings and cordial congratulations on behalf of the Soviet Armed Forces and from myself personally.

The processes under way in our countries of restructuring and of the democratization of socialist society, aimed at accelerating socioeconomic development, are creating favorable opportunities for expanding mutually advantageous cooperation, are having a positive effect on the development of multifaceted Soviet-Czechoslovak ties, and are helping to increase the might of the entire socialist community. The CSSR is making a worthy contribution to the struggle to reinforce peace in close unity with the Soviet Union and other fraternal Warsaw Pact member states.

On the festive day I wish you and all Czechoslovak servicemen new successes in strengthening the CSSR's defense capability in the interests of socialism.

With communist greetings

USSR Defense Minister Army General D. Yazov.

CPCZ Conferences Support Restructuring

PM1005102988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch under the rubric "From Socialist Countries: Life of Fraternal Parties": "Support for New Course"]

[Text] Prague, 3 May—Regional report and election conferences have been held in the CPCZ.

Chief attention was devoted to the party's work under conditions of restructuring. The conferences were distinguished by their critical assessment of what has been achieved and their desire to raise still higher the militancy of party organizations and the personal responsibility and activeness of every Communist. The party committees' reports and the delegates' speeches sharply raised the question of changing the style and methods of party work and the need to rule out the supplanting of economic and other organizations by party committees and to raise the standard of political educational and ideological work. In this connection great attention was devoted to the activities of primary party organizations.

The regional report and election conferences confirmed the Communists' full support for the policy of restructuring. They emphasized the indivisibility of restructuring and the broadening of democracy as the chief factors for strengthening the socialist society and revealing its potential and advantages more fully. The conferences adopted decisions aimed at further strengthening the party's leading role and increasing its ideological influence on all sections of society.

West Europe

FRG Socialist Leader Vogel Visits USSR

Met by Dobrynin, Others

LD1005162888 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, arrived in Moscow today at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

He was welcomed at Sheremetyevo Airport by Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, and other senior officials on the staff of the CPSU Central Committee.

The welcoming party included Andreas Meyer-Landrut, ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the USSR.

Vogel is known in his country and elsewhere in the world as a principled opponent of the arms race.

He has hailed the signature of the Soviet-American INF Treaty and is critical of plans by certain quarters in the West for building up the North Atlantic alliance's arms to counter the upcoming abolition of two classes of nuclear missiles.

Vogel wants next steps towards practical disarmament to come in the form of a 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive weapons and a ban on chemical warfare agents.

The leader of the major West German opposition party, he is an advocate of active dialogue between his party and the political parties of other countries, including communist parties.

He has been to the Soviet Union and other socialist states more than once and met with the leaders of the CPSU, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Bulgarian Communist Party and other parties.

Talks With Gorbachev

LD1105072988 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 11 TASS—A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), has just begun in the Kremlin.

The SPD leader arrived in Moscow Tuesday night at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

Reform Situation 'Serious'

LD1105133388 Hamburg DPA in German 1259 GMT 11 May 88

[Excerpt] Moscow (DPA)—Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev sees the reform process in the USSR connected with his name as being in "a serious situation." He said this today in Moscow during talks with Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel. As Vogel announced after 4 hours of talks in Gorbachev's office in the Kremlin, the party leader left no doubt that he would ultimately prevail with his ideas and had a broad majority of the population behind him.

According to Vogel, Gorbachev further underlined in the talks Moscow's interest in closer and more intensive relations with Bonn. He had expressed optimism that during the visit to Moscow by Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl in the fall, specific agreements would be possible. The party leader stressed that he saw "favorable possibilities for Berlin," too, in the future, the SPD chairman said.

Vogel did not exclude the possibility after the talks that it could bring about formal relations between the EEC and the East's CEMA. Problems that still exist—Romania still has reservations based on a single issue—could be solved.

According to Vogel, disarmament process took up a large part of the talks. Gorbachev expressed concern over whether disarmament talks were being held with the necessary seriousness by the Western side. The party leader was confident that the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty would soon be ratified.

Vogel's impression was that the leadership in Moscow was not pressing for a START talk agreement on halving long-range strategic missiles at the upcoming summit in the Soviet capital. It is possible that a document on the progress already achieved between the superpowers in this area may be adopted.

In the discussion on the global abolition of chemical weapons, Gorbachev acknowledged with interest and attentiveness the joint proposal by the SPD, SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany], and CPCZ on a "large scale experiment" in maintaining this ban in Central Europe.

Joint party issues were discussed at the talks, in which the following took part: Bundestag Deputies Hans Koschnik, Karsten Voigt, and Dietrich Stobbe from the SPD side, as well as Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin, Central Committee member Vadim Zagladin, and Gorbachev's adviser Anatoliy Chenyayev from the Soviet side. Vogel announced that his proposal that the SPD's weekly paper VORWAERTS be sold in the USSR in a limited printing of 10,000 copies had met with a friendly reception. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation, which is close to the SPD, should probably be able to open an office in Moscow.

The SPD chairman seemed strongly impressed by Gorbachev, like a series of Western politicians before him. Vogel particularly stressed his relaxed nature and the certainty with which Gorbachev tackled problems. He warned the West against expecting too much from the general secretary. He considered it very questionable to encourage the founding of parties in the USSR in the current situation. Such developments were unhelpful and could actually have a dangerous effect. [passage omitted]

Kohl Aide on Upcoming Summits With Gorbachev

LD1005081588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent dispatch under the rubric "From the IZVESTIYA Teletype Room": "Great Expectations"]

[Text] Bonn, 7 May—The upcoming official visit of FRG Chancellor H. Kohl to Moscow in the fall of 1988 and the official visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the FRG scheduled for the first half of 1989—visits which we view in close connection—are exceptionally important events, and we wish them success. H. Teltschik, leader of the foreign policy division of the federal chancellor's department, declared this in reply to a TASS correspondent's question during a meeting with foreign journalists.

Danish Election Issues, Progress Examined

Solovyev Commentary

OW1105021688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2230 GMT 10 May 88

[Vsevolod Solovyev commentary, from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades. For the first time this century, foreign policy issues rather than questions concerning the economy or internal politics are at the center of the Danish parliamentary elections. The current early elections were announced by Prime Minister Schluter in connection with the fact that the coalition cabinet, which he heads, did not agree with the resolution of the opposition Social-Democratic Party approved by a parliamentary majority.

The essence of the resolution, which sparked the government crisis, is as follows: Denmark considers it unacceptable to permit the passage through its territorial

waters and entry to its ports of foreign vessels carrying nuclear weapons, insofar as this is incompatible in peacetime with the country's security policy.

This resolution evoked a sharp reaction in London and Washington, to which it was primarily addressed, as well as in NATO as a whole. Leaders of this bloc consider that the antinuclear resolution adopted by the Danish parliament undermines the basis of the strategy of nuclear deterrence, and seriously complicates military cooperation within the bloc. In other words, the resolution is nothing less than a principled challenge to NATO's basic policy. Naturally, the NATO members put massive pressure on this country.

Announcing the elections, Prime Minister Schluter stressed that he really views them as a referendum on the question of Danish membership of NATO. He said: I want to force Danes to realize that membership in NATO is not just a matter of rights, but of responsibilities too, primarily the adoption of the general strategy of NATO, including nuclear arms.

Of course, he figured that most Danes currently see no alternative to Denmark's participation in NATO. However, his calculations may bring about the opposite result. Public opinion polls have shown that 82 percent of Danes are striving for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe and that 46 percent of Danes are prepared to drop out of NATO if the idea of a nuclear-free north is unacceptable.

As you see, the preponderance of supporters for the country's participation in NATO is not that great. The latest polls show that the opposition was gaining strength as the elections approached, while the ruling coalition, headed by Schluter, can retain its minimal majority in parliament only with the greatest difficulty.

Focus on Foreign Policy Issues

LD1005174788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 10 May 88

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Valentin Dvinin]

[Text] Parliamentary elections are being held in Denmark today, 10 May, for the second time in 8 months. The Danes must elect 179 deputies out of nearly 1,200 candidates representing 12 parties.

Early elections were called by Prime Minister Schluter in connection with the mid-April parliamentary resolution proposed by the large opposition Social Democratic Party. Its essence is that the government should inform commanders of foreign warships entering Danish ports that the presence of nuclear weapons on Danish territory in peacetime is forbidden. This decision aroused the open displeasure and even threats from the United States and several other NATO countries, which believe that the antinuclear resolution will damage the militaristic policy of nuclear deterrence. On the eve of the election, Denmark came under increased pressure from the NATO leadership. Local observers stress that this is the first time that Danes have had to express an opinion in an election on foreign policy questions rather than on economic or some other questions of internal policy.

Opinion Polls 'Contradictory'

LD1005191388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] [Announcer Pavel Kasparov] From the results of the presidential elections in France, let us now turn to the parliamentary elections in Denmark. They are taking place today, and listen to what Valentin Gubernatorov, our Copenhagen correspondent, reports in this connection:

[Gubernatorov] Despite the fact that today is an ordinary working day in Denmark, voting is proceeding fairly actively. At one local station that I visited at noon, 30 percent of the electorate had already voted. No one is predicting the outcome of the elections, even now, as the day is coming to a close. Voting will end at 2200 Moscow time, and then the counting of votes will start.

The latest public opinion polls are rather contradictory. Some predict success in the elections for the opposition, in particular the Social Democrats. The results of others allow conservative parties to hope for an improvement in their position in parliament. Whatever the case, even the very fact that these early elections are being held is to a significant extent a victory for the peace-loving forces of Denmark. When the antimilitarist majority in parliament voted for what was, on the whole, an inoffensive resolution—requiring the government to inform captains of warships entering Danish ports about Denmark's non-nuclear policy in peacetime—this was already a victory, evidently felt among NATO circles. Denmark's NATO allies, and above all, the United States and Britain, sharply declared that the adopted resolution could damage the policy of the nuclear powers of the bloc, one of the main principles of which remains the provision to neither deny nor confirm the presence of nuclear weapons on board its ships. The Danish conservative minority cabinet was also on the side of the NATO allies.

This was already the 23d resolution on security policy adopted against the will of conservative circles in the Folketing. Prior to this, resolutions were adopted in the Danish parliament aimed, for instance, against U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Western Europe, the modernization of old and the deployment of new tactical nuclear weapons on the continent, and against the militarization of space.

Many journalists who have arrived here from many countries note in their commentaries that the NATO allies are scared by the prospect that Denmark will

follow the example of New Zealand, which, as we know, already officially demands a guarantee of the absence of nuclear weapons on warships entering its ports. The Social Democratic Party of Denmark, the initiator of the resolution adopted last month in the Folketing, has put forward a slogan for the elections: Denmark is deciding for itself—Denmark without nuclear weapons and the Schluter government.

Bourgeois parties have tried to cast doubts on the loyalty of the Social Democrats to the NATO bloc, though the Social Democrats still stress that it was they who brought the country into NATO. The majority of Danes do not yet see an alternative to the country's NATO membership. The formulation of the question of the continued existence within the bloc, which is being made by the bourgeois parties, is calculated to alienate adherents to NATO policy from the Social Democrats.

Denmark Nuclear Issue Leads to Greenland Crisis

LD1005214588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 10 May 88

[Report by TASS correspondent Ye. Kiselev]

[Text] Copenhagen, 10 May (TASS)—The battle on the eve of the early election in Denmark, which is being held today, has led to a government crisis in Greenland. This island, the biggest in the world, is part of the Danish Kingdom but is an autonomous area and sends two deputies to the Danish parliament. The Danish news agency RITZAUS BUREAU reports that the leadership of the leading party in the ruling coalition, Siumut, which adopts Social Democratic positions, has decided to end government cooperation with the leftist party Unuit Ataqatigiit (IA), since during the election campaign the latter cast doubt on the usefulness of Greenland's NATO membership. Siumut believes that the island, as part of Denmark, should respect its membership in NATO. In accordance with the Danish Constitution, questions of defense and foreign policy come under the mother country in spite of Greenland's autonomy.

Serious disagreements have also appeared in the Landsstyre (government) on the question of the recent conclusion of an agreement on the allocation of income from minerals in Greenland between the island's leadership and the Danish cabinet. Siumit regards it as a "historic event" for local self-government, but IA is calling for new talks on the agreement.

Siumut now intends to form a minority cabinet with the parliamentary support of the moderate bourgeois party Atassut, which is in opposition. Together these two parties hold 22 out of the 27 seats in the Landsting (parliament).

IA leader A. Lynge has described the decision by Siumut as a "stab in the back." "It is unacceptable for the election campaign to lead to a collapse in government cooperation. IA and Siumut are parties with different approaches, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that on the eve of the elections, views should be expressed a little more forcefully than usual", he told RIZAUS BUREAU.

O. Steenholds, the leader of Atassut, said his party will support the Siumut minority government. He believes the two parties have much in common in their approach to economic policy.

Fishing Negotiations Held in Stockholm

LD0605170788 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 6 May 88

[Text] Stockholm May 6 TASS—The Soviet-Swedish negotiations were held here on questions of fishing in the light of the fulfillment of the intergovernmental agreement on the principles of demarcating sea expanses in the Baltic Sea signed by the USSR and Sweden on January 13, 1988 during the official visit to Sweden of N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Soviet-Swedish agreement on delimiting the continental shelf, and also the Soviet economic zone and the Swedish fishing zone in the Baltic Sea, and the agreement on relationship in the field of fishing in the former disputable area of the Baltic Sea, which were signed during the working visit to Moscow of Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Andersson, on April 18, 1988.

During the talks, the sides considered questions of distributing catch quotas for 1988, fishing regulations in the former disputable area of the Baltic Sea, and also other problems.

Under the agreements signed, Soviet fishermen can annually catch 18,000 tons of fish in the Swedish part of the former disputable sea space and Swedish fishermen—6,000 tons in the Soviet area. The documents provide for regulating the catch to preserve the fish stock in this area.

Security, Cooperation Talks Held With Swiss

LD0505201888 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 5 May 88

[Text] Bern May 5 TASS—Soviet-Swiss consultations were held here on May 4-5. Discussed were questions of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states, parties to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and also prospects of further development of the all-European process.

The consultations were held from the Soviet side by Chief of the Department for Questions of Security and Cooperation in Europe of the USSR Foreign Ministry Yuriy Deryabin and the USSR Ambassador in Switzerland Zoya Novozhilova, from the Swiss side—officials of the Foreign Affairs Department of Switzerland, with Secretary of State of the Department Edouard Brunner at the head.

More on Reelection of France's Mitterrand

LD1005163488 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Paris May 10 TASS—TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reports:

The French Ministry of the Interior issued the final returns of the second, final round of the presidential elections held on Sunday. Francois Mitterrand was elected president of the Republic for a second term of seven years. 54.02 percent of the poll was cast for him. 45.98 percent of the votes was cast for candidate of right-wing parties Jaques Chirac.

Francois Mitterrand will turn 72 in October. He took part in the movement of resistance to Hitlerites in the years of the Second World War, was member of the provisional government of General Charles de Gaulle. Over 40 years, Francois Mitterrand has been on the political scene of France. In the forties-fifties, he held ministerial posts eleven times. Prior to his election president in 1981, he was first secretary of the French Socialist Party.

Relying on the unconditional support of the socialists, Francois Mitterrand tried to present himself at the latest elections not as socialist candidate but as defender of the interests of "all French men and women". He did not pose the question of major socio-economic transformations, but placed an emphasis on the continuity of the policy, on the need to preserve stability, called the people of France for unity and rallying of the reports in the name of the "flourishing of the nation". In the international area, he declared for vigorous European development. Approving of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and declaring for the reduction of strategic offensive arms of the USA and the USSR and for the continuation of the process of disarmament he, at the same time, demanded that the French nuclear "deterrence forces" be preserved in their present volume. In his first statment after his reelection, he promised to serve the cause of the development of poor countries, the cause of disarmament and peace.

The French Communist Party made a considerable contribution to Mitterrand's success. Prior to the second round, it urged the voters supporting the French Communist Party to cast their ballots for Mitterrand, regarding this as the only opportunity to bar the road to power to the right-wing and ultra-right forces. The Communists have done their duty, said General Secretary of the French Communist Party Georges Marchais. But the working people should not expect any improvements from Mitterrand's reelection. The problems facing the country remain acute and await solution.

PRAVDA To Be Published in Austria

LD0505115288 Moscow TASS In English 1018 GMT 5 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—The newspaper PRAVDA of the CPSU Central Committee will be published in Austria starting from May 18.

Its circulation will be tens of thousands of copies. The newspaper will also go on sale in other German-speaking countries.

PRAVDA has been brought out daily in English in the United States starting from 1986, said the paper's Deputy Chief Editor Yevgeniy Grigoryev.

Weekly digests appear in Australia, Great Britain, Spain and New Zealand.

"Besides the regular publication in Austria, we are planning to organise its daily publishing in Great Britain," Grigoryev said. "Due to translation, these publications will be only one or two days behind the Moscow editions."

Tolkunov Receives Europarliamentarians

LD0505212288 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 5 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and cooperation Lev Tolkunov received here today deputy chairman of the Europarliament's political commission, Europarliament deputy from the Socialist faction K. Hensch and deputy general secretary of the Europarliament's Socialist faction N. Gresche.

A talk was held on ways of intensifying the dialogue between European East and West, carrying into life the provisions of the Final Helsinki Act. The guests learnt about the course of perestroyka and democratisation in our country.

International Press Institute Meets in Turkey

LD0905191088 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Istanbul May 9 TASS—The International Press Institute (IPI), a public organisation which unites journalists, newspaper and magazine editors and publishers, opened its conference here today. The meeting is expected to discuss various aspects of the work of the mass media. The current, 37th, conference in Istanbul is attended by representatives of 39 countries, including delegations from the Soviet Union and the PRC which came for the first time.

The conference was addressed by Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Ozal.

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Leaders 'Instruct' Contras To Wreck Talks

PM1105081588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 May 88 First Edition p 5

[S. Gorbunov article: "United States Undermining a Settlement"]

[Text] ...Ground service workers at Toncontin Airport outside Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras, have long been used to seeing military transport aircraft of the U.S. Air Force appear in Honduran skies with the frequency and regularity of airliners. No one was surprised when another U.S. C-130 Hercules heavy military aircraft landed. However, it brought containers full of "clothing, footwear, and knapsacks for Nicaraguan freedom fighters," as U.S. and Honduran officials explained to journalists.

The Nicaraguan Government resolutely condemned that action, emphasizing that the delivery of military equipment to the contras via the U.S. Agency for International Development and the territory of Honduras runs counter to the truce agreement signed by representatives of the Nicaraguan authorities and the counterrevolutionary leaders in Sapoa. By beginning an airlift of so-called "humanitarian aid" to Somozist camps in Honduras, Washington did, in fact, jeopardize the talks on a final cease-fire in Nicaragua.

And then dozens of Nicaraguan and foreign journalists, who spent whole days on selfless duty in the Camino Real Hotel in Managua, reported to their newspapers and magazines: "The second round of direct talks on a final cease-fire in Nicaragua ended without a result." For those who had been attentively following the course of the Sandinista-contras meeting, this report was not unexpected. The Reagan administration, which, to use a U.S. press expression, "had been taken unawares" by the agreement signed in Sapoa on 23 March on a temporary truce in Nicaragua, had done everything possible to avoid a repetition of such unpleasant surprises for itself.

On the eve of the talks in Managua, Elliott Abrams, U.S. assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, visited Miami, where the headquarters of the Somozist counterrevolution is situated, to carefully instruct the contra delegation. He coped successfully with his mission, presumably. The contra leaders took an obstructionist stand at the Managua meeting, rejecting a whole series of constructive proposals from the Nicaraguan Government. The government delegation still succeeded in reaching agreement with the counterrevolutionaries to hold a new round of the dialogue on 12-14 May, although the question of the venue remains open.

What prevented the sides from reaching an agreement this time—in a comfortable hotel? The question of supplies for the counterrevolutionary groupings, in particular, was the stumbling block at the talks. Here is a noteworthy fact: Shortly before the second round, the contra leaders issued public statements that their troops were almost dying of hunger through the fault of the Sandinistas, who were preventing the arrival of "humanitarian" aid. However, at the meeting in Managua, the same leaders of the counterrevolution categorically refused to receive this "humanitarian" aid via the International Red Cross, as proposed by the Nicaraguan Government, and stubbornly insisted that it be provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The Reagan administration and the contra leaders evidently have weighty "grounds" for rejecting the mediation of the International Red Cross in distributing this aid. As J. Crawford, former officer of the U.S. Special Forces, reported in an interview with the NUEVA NICARAGUA agency, under the guise of "humanitarian" aid, the White House is continuing to give the contras direct military aid—in circumvention of the decisions of the U.S. Congress.

"Project Hope" is the name of a U.S. organization which as long ago as 1986 supposedly was involved in providing the contras with "medical supplies." "In actual fact, weapons, ammunition, and explosives made up 90 percent of the freight being forwarded. I saw this myself," Crawford reported. "Project Hope" is now figuring once again among the organizations hired to transfer "humanitarian" aid to the Somozists.

At the Camino Real, the contra representatives also rejected another Nicaraguan Government proposal: to extend by a further month the truce which, under the Sapoa agreement, expires on 30 May, in order to resolve technical questions of ending the war. Thus, there is extremely little time left to complete the talks, and the counterrevolutionary leaders are not only not contributing to their progress but dragging out the dialogue in every possible way: They advance political conditions which they know to be unacceptable to the government and, contrary to their earlier demands, insist that the talks be moved from Nicaragua to some other country. Well, the information provided by Crawford goes a long way toward explaining these actions. Even before the talks started, many political commentators were warning that the United States and the contras would try to use them just as a means to gain time to regroup and rearm the counterrevolutionary formations thoroughly battered by the Sandinist People's Army. If the talks fail, Washington hopes to shift all the blame onto the Nicaraguan Government and resume overt military aid to the Somozists.

Commentary on Anniversary of Ties With Cuba

PA1005203988 Moscow to Cuba in Spanish 0100 GMT 9 May 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The Soviet and Cuban peoples today commemorate the 28th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Cuba.

It was a difficult era for the young Republic, which was establishing new state structures while suffering constant provocations from U.S. imperialism, an imperialism that spared no means to destroy the Cuban revolution.

At precisely that crucial moment, as revolutionary leaders have repeatedly stated, the USSR extended its friendly hand to Cuba. It helped the people of the Island of Freedom resist the confrontation with the main imperialist power, despite the economic blockade and the subsequent armed aggression.

More than 25 years have passed since then. The relations between the USSR and Cuba are an example of a new kind of relations between a great power and a relatively small state. These relations are based on the firm principles of socialist internationalism: respect for national sovereignty, nonintervention in others' domestic affairs, absolute equality, and equal responsibility in the fulfillment of internationalist duties.

The Soviets highly value the current status of our bilateral relations with Cuba, which cover, in fact, all facets of life and serve to bring our peoples closer, making them true friends.

We are also pleased with the great outlook for the development and consolidation of the fraternal ties between the two countries, which was discussed during recent meetings between Comrades Fidel Castro and Mikhail Gorbachev.

We send our heartfelt congratulations to our listeners today, and we wish them success in building the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere.

Congratulations, friends, on the day of our common joy.

Dobrynin, Cuban Communist Party's Risquet Meet

LD1005223788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Risquet, member of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party, met [place not specified] on 10 May. Risquet spoke about the talks held in London at the beginning of May on a settlement in southwest Africa, which was attended by representatives of Angola, Cuba, the United States, and the RSA. The participants in the meeting reaffirmed their desire to continue to work in every way toward strengthening the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola, and achieving independence for Namibia in accordance with Security Council Resolution 435 and other UN decisions. During the course of the meeting, Comrade Dobrynin spoke about the restructuring process in the USSR, and preparations for the 19th all-union party conference.

The meeting was held in an atmosphere of friendship and complete mutual understanding. Camacho, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party and ambassador of the Republic of Cuba to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

Maslyukov Receives Cuban Minister Portal

LD1005223588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2107 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] On 10 May, Comrade Maslyukov received Portal, the Cuban minister of basic industry, who is in the USSR.

Mokanu Comments on Results of Caribbean Tour

PM1005120588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Kamorin: "Interparliamentary Ties: Searching for Points of Contact"]

[Text] Havana—The goodwill visit by a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies to a number of Caribbean countries is over.

The Soviet parliamentarians visited Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, and Jamaica, met with those states' leaders, legislators, and representatives of political parties, and had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the Caribbean countries' economic development plans and culture. Before the group of delegates returned home, A.A. Mokanu, head of the delegation, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, spoke to your IZVESTIYA correspondent:

"We are pleased with the results, particularly bearing in mind that this is the first visit by a Soviet parliamentary delegation to these Caribbean countries. On absolutely all occasions we were received warmly and with interest. Our conversations broached questions of bilateral relations and key problems of world politics. Our interlocutors showed particular interest in the revolutionary transformations taking place in our society.

"Of course we also came across phenomena such as a lack of information on the part of those states' citizens about Soviet reality and prejudices created by anti-Soviet propaganda. However, our meetings also showed that these stereotypes are not as entrenched as they may seem. In any event, we sensed an undoubted growth of interest in the transformations taking place in the USSR."

Political & Social

Gorbachev Meets With Media Officials

PM1105110588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 May 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report under the general heading "Through Democratization—Toward a New Face of Socialism. Meeting in the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] It has already been reported that a meeting with leaders of the mass media, ideological institutions, and creative unions took place in the CPSU Central Committee 7 May. An account of this meeting is published below.

M.S. Gorbachev: We want to devote today's meeting to the forthcoming 19th party conference. We can see that society and the party have joined in the process of preparing for it. This is why there is a need for guidelines.

The press has already inaugurated the appropriate rubrics and discussion is essentially already under way—and it is going on not only within the party framework; it is a nationwide discussion. I think that the mass media already have a certain amount of experience here, a certain amount has been accumulated, and various questions have been raised. Hence I propose: You, comrades, go ahead, express your opinions, raise questions, and then I will speak. If there are no objections, we will adopt this procedure.

N.M. Gribachev, chief editor of the journal SOVETSKIY SOYUZ, was the first to speak.

All Soviet people, he said, expect a very great deal from the party conference. It seems to me, however, that a certain passiveness can currently be observed among Communists. Some of them are waiting to see which way the wind will blow.

It is currently fashionable to sail the rivers of history. I will take the liberty of doing the same. So, the party prepared the revolution, the party under V.I. Lenin's leadership accomplished the revolution, the party is continuing the revolution. And this is impossible—simply impossible, dear comrades—without unity in the party ranks and without every Communist assuming a serious responsibility. V.I. Lenin repeatedly raised the question of party unity. I think that this question will inevitably surface, in some form or another, at the party conference.

Now I would like to say a few words about the press which we represent. The press has a tremendous role to play, including in preparing for the party conference. It is particularly important at this time to know whether everything is perfectly in order in our journalists' corps. Do we always adopt a responsible attitude toward the cause?

Developing this thesis, the speaker spoke about the need to examine historical facts in a principled and honest way and from party positions and to avoid oversimplification of these facts and an indiscriminate approach to the most acute problems. At present this kind of approach is not a rare occurrence in our journalism.

It is particularly important, the speech went on to note, to ensure that all our journalism is truthful to the utmost and is based on accurate and verified facts. After all it can happen that a trivial fact is violated in one case, then in another, and as a result there is an overall undermining of trust in items about restructuring.

I personally believe that there is no need for any administrative measures here. Let people work calmly. Other things are more important. First, educational work in journalism. It must be deepended and intensified. Second, it is necessary to assess every statement from party positions, to constantly show concern for and think of the unity of the party ranks, to be even more strictly exacting toward ourselves. "Lapses" in work will then diminish.

The forthcoming party conference will certainly discuss the results of our work which we call restructuring, S.V. Vikulov, chief editor of the journal NASH SOVREMENNIK, said. Readers' letters to all the mass media now testify that the people are seeking an answer to this question and want to really feel its results.

These results must not be assessed in a primitive fashion, only from a mundane point of view, as it were. We must not forget for a single moment the main point—the human soul, the human factor.

I believe, the speaker went on to say, that the first and foremost result of restructuring is that all of us, the whole people, have become different from what we were. People have found their voices, they are talking and they are talking in a demanding fashion, at times with indignation and even anger, about the things obstructing restructuring. And the important point is that people are speaking not from positions of personal interests but from positions of state interests, the motherland's interests. Even those who from time immemorial have lived with a "nothing to do with me" attitude are now starting to think in the spirit of restructuring.

This is evident in readers' letters. People are frankly expressing their opinion, which at times does not coincide with what they read in the pages of our publications. There are profound conclusions and very businesslike proposals. I would say that, in general, these letters are a mine of the people's wisdom and experience. These letters are the tuning fork of the people's soul. It is a great pity that we can't find the time to fully process and study these letters. After all, in essence this is nothing else but a nationwide referendum. People are themselves answering questions and baring their souls, and therefore their

voice must be heeded. Unfortunately, the letters departments in many editorial offices are too small to deal with this huge mailbag, while some literary and art journals do not even have such departments at all. We, for example, do not have a single person who could work in a letters department. That's the nature of our staffing situation, unfortunately.

Yet, as we know, the West has entire institutes to study public opinion. Now that we need to know with absolute accuracy what the people are thinking about what is happening in the country, comrades, why don't we give some thought to more intensive study of the people's opinion and the creation of appropriate institutions.

The speaker went on to dwell in detail on the party's role in restructuring and spoke of the need to resolutely combat bureaucracy. The mass media have a weighty role to play in this struggle, whose results are awaited by the whole people.

At the same time, the press must raise the question of making stricter demands of Communists and cleansing the party ranks of those who disgrace this lofty title. I think that this view ought to be discussed at the party conference. Let the party be built according to the principle: "Better to have fewer people but of better quality." I perceive this as one of the potential areas for boosting its prestige.

Speaking about the role of the intelligentsia and the masses in the transformations which are gathering pace in society, the speaker stressed that the goal of all the work which we call restructuring is to finally overcome indifference and inspire the people. We have the courage to admit the mistakes of the past. The people have waited a long time for this courage, and they are in favor of restructuring with every fiber of their soul.

Now it is important to stand up straight, proudly raise our heads, roll up our sleeves, and get down to work. The mass media must now achieve the main objective—to awaken people's sense of pride in their country and confidence in the victory of restructuring.

The moment we are currently living through is a very serious time, a turning-point time, NOVYY MIR Chief Editor S.P. Zalygin noted in his speech. It cannot be said that everything is fine, that success is assured. I think that, no, it is not assured. Very serious steps are required to assure it. It must not be thought that those whom we call the masses—the intelligentsia, the working class, the peasantry—are all rapturously accepting restructuring. The part of social life which very often passes us by must not be disregarded. The point is that we are not very good at listening and being guided by public opinion. You can see what is happening. How many demonstrations and pickets we are witnessing, how many complaints about new construction or the felling of forests. But this is not only about trees, not only about forests. Unless we now respond to people demanding the preservation of nature we will become estranged from them. They will not trust us.

There is quite definite contact between the party leadership and the public. But as soon as the middle link gets involved things break down and we lose this contact. How can we not return to ecological problems! Everybody can now sense that in another 5 or 6 years that will be that—there will be no hope. Then we can talk about restructuring or whatever we like, but the resources will have been destroyed. And people realize this.

The speaker went on to stress the importance of the correct selection of cadres. It must not be thought that you only have to remove two or three people and then things will be sorted out. No, these people will have been operating in a certain environment. On their own they could not have existed. So we need to dig deeper to ascertain who is linked to whom and whether these links have now been destroyed or not.

M.S. Gorbachev: Cadres, then. This is a very tricky subject. Some 66 percent of our ministers, 61 percent of obkom first secretaries and oblkispolkom chairmen, and 63 percent of party gorkom and raykom first secretaries are new. This is the kind of change that has taken place. Many of them have already demonstrated their worth, have shown that they have reacted correctly to the times, have take on special burdens, are sensitive to the new changes, and are responsive to people. There are many people like that. And there are people who never committed any violations punishable by law. But the past has left its mark on them.

New and often unexpected people are now coming to the fore. The people are noticing and supporting them. This is why we all need to pledge ourselves to democracy and the democratic process. There is a need for permanently operating mechanisms which will feed talented, energetic, and really capable people through the funnel of public opinion into leadership at every level. This is better and more reliable than appointment from above. This is democracy.

Even democracy involves costs. This can happen, comrades. But I do not believe that anyone can offer us a more correct approach. Therefore this process will develop. Reality is reality, and it is multidimensional. For example, a certain good man sent me a letter recently. He writes: I am a supporter of yours. You spoke recently, Mikhail Sergeyevich, and I noticed that you were starting to get nervous. I have to tell you that this is a luxury available to subordinates but not to leaders.

The people have been discussing things. This is good, comrades. It comes within the framework of glasnost. Nothing can compromise a leader as much as an attempt to deal with a person for criticism as happened in the bad old days.

We must live in accordance with Lenin. With how much passion and at what cost to his health did he devote himself to uniting, rallying, and consolidating people on a principled basis! This is how we must act, devoting everything for the sake of restructuring.

S.P. Zalygin: So we have come here with our demands.

It seems to me that the role of the public needs to be intensified. Say, for example, a report by some minister is going to be presented—in the CPSU Central Committee or the USSR Council of Ministers. Why not create before this some kind of public advisory body [obshchestvennyy sovet] consisting of people closely linked with this special subject? So they could go to the meeting and put questions to the person presenting the report.

We have set up various societies recently, but bureaucratic apparatuses have emerged in them and correspondence has flowed to such an extent that we have again ended up with something different from what we wanted.

M.S. Gorbachev: Unfortunately people come into these social organizations with the stereotypes and the mentality of the pre-restructuring period. And their first concern is for a direct government telephone line, good premises, a car, and so forth. And workers in the localities so they have someone to give instructions to. Often this is as far as the activity of social organizations goes. It gets to the point where the slightest criticism leveled at them is regarded as disrepct for those whom this social organization unites.

This is a very widespread phenomenon. Many people are pursuing their own selfish, egoistic interests but want to promote them in the convenient guise of concern for the people and socialism.

My personal inclination is to always respond with my heart to a person who sincerely strives for good and feels closely the people's pain and the life we lead. He can even be misguided or mistaken, but such a person, I believe, must be understood and can be helped.

S.P. Zalygin: But why shouldn't two or three societies present reports? Say a society has been formed and a year has passed—we should take a look...

M.S. Gorbachev: Or two or three journals.

S.P. Zalygin: Excuse me. A journal is on view; you can see it, it's there in print.

V.G. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, spoke. Both a concealed and an overt argument is currently being conducted among journalists, writers, and workers in the mass news and propaganda media. What is more important: unrestrained criticism of what was and what is, or some positive proposals and the elaboration of forms, methods, and means of resolving the urgent problems that face us? We still think that, despite all the importance of criticism, including criticism of our history, the chief thing now is still creative work. If we are touching on problems of history, I think that we must rely, above all, on the facts and not on various kinds of reminiscences and fabrications. In this way we only confuse public opinion, muddle history, and introduce confusion into the brains of our young people.

Dwelling on the questions to be examined at the upcoming party conference, the speaker emphasized that it will be necessary, above all, to speak clearly and definitely once again about the leading role of the party. Why? Because there are now direct attempts under the flag and slogan of democracy, which at times can be very good, to dilute the party by homogenizing it with the people and some other organizations.

Another important question is the structure of party organs. PRAVDA receives many letters containing suggestions about this. There are proposals, for example, for the elimination and abolition of sectoral departments and an examination of the actual siting of party organs.

Maybe control is also a very complex question. Our readers and some scientists propose reviving and restoring the Central Control Commission in the party. And the logic is rather curious: We do not have an opposition party, but we speak of socialist pluralism, and the Central Control Commission is the party's walls; thus, we will have socialist pluralism, but there will be very clear, rigid control over the work of our leading party comrades.

Our most complex issues are questions of the economy, agricultural production, and consumer goods. We have adopted a radical economic reform. But let us state bluntly: The reform is not proceeding as it ought. First, because the administer and command apparatus is still very great. It produces nothing but paper. Everyone writes, orders, and issues directives, and there is a mass of checks and commissions. Clearly, we must more resolutely undertake the reorganization of our managerial apparatus.

At the center we observe: A ministry has been cut back, but some institution has been organized next door. All the officials who were working at the ministry move to the other apparatus. I do not know of a single case where a prominent engineer has moved from an office to a machine tool, a plant, or a factory. It is necessary to drastically change people's mentality. This is complex and difficult, but we will not get far without this, and cutting an apparatus will lead to nothing. We at PRAVDA have written about this and will do so again.

A word or two about criticism. Things have again become bad. At one time criticism was made, and people responded to criticism. Now there is again some avoidance of responding to critical remarks. We comment once, we comment twice, we comment three times. People do not respond.

Of course, we still make a mass of blunders and mistakes, sometimes we criticize the wrong person and defend the wrong person. We admit all this. We struggle against this however we can. We struggle earnestly.

A.A. Ananyev, chief editor of the journal OKTYABR, devoted his speech to problems of studying the history of the country, the history of the revolution. He used specific examples to show that this study is frequently conducted badly and superficially. There are many such instances.

M.S. Gorbachev: When I was preparing for the report on the 70th anniversary of October I was given from the stockrooms a list of documentary movies on the most important stages of the country's life. We have a vast stock of newsreels which in themselves, even without commentaries, make strong propaganda material. We must make better use of them and more widely familiarize the people with them....

A.A. Ananyev: We must use historical parallels to give people the sense of being the master of their land and their country. For there is not even a law on land. But there should be, as there is on ecology. For what happens is that a bulldozer comes along, and chernozem gets buried while clay is brought to the surface. Who is accountable for this?

The speaker made a suggestion—to set up a special commission to examine the question of agriculture in a most fundamental fashion, in all its aspects. All conditions must be created so that the person—the master, the working person—can take root on the land. So that his children and grandchildren continue his cause. The peasant must not become a nomad. And the lease contract should be propagandized from these positions.

At present our contract workers take land only for one season, and they are prepared to wrest from it everything they can. It is not known if he will take this land or some other the next year. This is an extremely important question, perhaps the most important one....

M.S. Gorbachev: I agree. A Politburo session discussed this recently. I also have the impression that there are some things we are not thinking through. It can still transpire that a peasant is prevented from really getting into his work, so that he can feel and realize his potential as a master, as an independent person. Within kolkhozes, if the idea of the lease contract is realized correctly and fully, the benefit could be colossal. All opportunities to maneuver, including maneuvering equipment, must be created for every lessee. This must be guaranteed by a lease contract.

What a huge pyramid still presses down on the peasant. We still do not entirely trust him. But for no reason. People are able to assess the situation in a mature manner. I have been told of a kolkhoz in Ulyanovsk Oblast which has gone over completely to the contract, where the kolkhoz members would not take 10 specialists in any of their teams. They refused. They know that these people are idlers. (Animation in the hall).

It must be put down in writing: If someone wants to lease land and work to a contract, with a lease, no one has the right to refuse him. People still refuse now. The lessee's hands must be untied!

A voice: In Moscow Oblast's Krasnogorskiy Rayon there are now 1,000 families employed on the family contract....

M.S. Gorbachev: I think that if there is a small city near a kolkhoz or a sovkhoz, then city people who wish to cultivate the land must not be refused—let people grow vegetables and fruit and do some farming.

We have socialism and a socialist economic system. But how best to combine private and public interests, and what should be the nature of relations today?—this is what must be decided. And it can be seen that we are on the right road. The person must be the master. He is tired of being hassled and ordered around by people just how they like. A machine operator in Pskov Oblast became a lessee. He built a house and restored a tractor and a combine. Explaining why he did this, he says: I was tired of every Tom, Dick, and Harry coming and ordering me around. In the middle of my work I have to stop, report, and say how things are going, while the guy who turns up shows his mettle. I was sick of it. People think I'm a fool, but I feel that there are many such people around me. (Laughter). I support that machine operator. People's hands must be untied, and they must be given an opportunity to live and farm on the land.

Voice: In order to free people's hands legislation is needed to protect the worker....

M.S. Gorbachev: Legislation is needed. I know that peasants, rural workers must be assigned jobs. And these jobs must be protected by law. The same applies in industry and construction.

I.D. Laptev, IZVESTIYA editor in chief, said: What matters most to us, as journalists and ideologists, is how we are doing the job which has been entrusted to us, how we are advancing the policy of glasnost, how we are developing and asserting it, and what we have achieved. The policy of glasnost, he said, has already put down such deep roots that there is no going back.

Not only the Soviet people but the entire world now views the policy of glasnost as an indicator of the progress of our restructuring. People link their own future and the future of the whole country with it. Therefore it is no accident that any threat to glasnost has such repercussions and evokes such a reaction in the people as a whole.

However, problems have cropped up even in the policy of glasnost itself. And this has to be discussed during the preparations for the conference. For instance, we have proved ill prepared for the elucidation and interpretation of the new problems, the new facts which are arising in the process of democratization itself, in the course of life itself.

M.S. Gorbachev: Quite correct. The party too has proved insufficiently prepared, and so has the press and the whole of society. There is probably an explanation for this, however.

I.D. Laptev: You could mention the problems affecting young people here, and history, and all that is being written and said about the problems of relations between nationalities. We did not expect many of these phenomena to crop up. For instance, how many times did journalists and correspondents, especially central newspaper journalists and correspondents, visit Nagorno-Karabakh. There was much that they did not see, much that they did not notice.

As a result we did not come up with an effective approach to these problems, we lost the initiative, and here and there we even lost control of the situation. What conclusion is to be drawn from this? We must tell ourselves quite clearly: If phenomena or events of this kind are a blow to restructuring, our silence about these phenomena or events is even more damaging, or at best just as damaging.

This is of the utmost importance. Because otherwise the earnestness of our intentions, our view about the place of public opinion and the place of the press in the modern world are immediately called into question. And I would also like to draw the following conclusions: It is impossible today to suppress a single fact relating to social life once it has happened. It cannot be done. It is not within anyone's power.

Suppression is harmful. It breeds rumors, fabrications, lack of confidence. Sometimes information alone resolves the problems. The speaker corroborated this statement by citing a series of concrete examples, referring to articles published in IZVESTIYA. Many events and phenomena, he said, demand a quick and widespread response and a bold approach. These situations will continue to arise because they are engendered by democratization.

We understand that this kind of phenomena are grist to Western propaganda's mill. This is unquestionably so. However, the less we talk about them, the longer we leave it before we mention them, the more grist there will be. Is it not time to stop trying to justify our own mistakes and failures with references to our ideological opponents' intrigues? As yet attempts of this kind are quite frequent, but they merely serve to emphasize our shortcomings in, among other things, the policy of glasnost.

Over the past 3 years many important decisions and new laws have been adopted. I believe that the upcoming party conference will adopt crucial decisions. It would not be amiss to take a look at how the decisions and laws that have been adopted so far are being implemented. And if we honestly look the truth in the eye, we will have to admit that frequently many of them are revised as soon as they have been adopted.

Who is to blame for this? Indeed, the bureaucrats. We have already spoken about this here. However, in my opinion, the reasons for this lie nonetheless in the incompleteness of decisions which are being adopted today.

This is particularly obvious in the economic sphere. And that despite the fact that the center of gravity of restructuring lies precisely here. People want to work. This desire has been rekindled in them. They are saying, they are clamoring: Let us work, let us! Remove the countless irresponsible taskmasters, endless paperwork and reports, free us from checks, hectoring, conferences, and coordination meetings!

And the upshot? We criticize bureaucrats for all we are worth, yet it has absolutely no effect on them.

We are now preparing for the conference, we have introduced various rubrics and are publishing all kind of materials. I believe that the crux of our entire restructuring effort and the future of the country is contained in one short phrase: "Let people work."

Great demoralization and great dependence, compounded by the shadow economy, have made people forget how to work, G.Ya. Baklanov, chief editor of the journal ZNAMYA, said. And many of them still don't want to work, it has become part of their mentality. A bureaucrat loves order and sets about creating it, but life is not order, life is spontaneous. And who is disrupting this order? It is above all the intelligentsia. It is because, using its intelligence, it is constantly trying to find reasons, trying to understand what course life should take, what are the natural laws to which it is subject. It has been said that our intelligentsia has grown philistine, that it has not proved itself in the struggle for glasnost and restructuring. That it is soft and spineless. How can it be said that the intelligentsia has not proved itself in the struggle for restructuring?! Has perhaps the press been functioning all these years without the participation of the intelligentsia? I believe that the intelligentsia has shown itself to be selfless.

The speaker went on to say that it is necessary to very rigorously raise the question about justice everywhere and about individual decency. About individual decency above all. We cannot have a situation where a contemporary "leading" author is published in bigger editions than Dostoyevskiy.

The bureaucratic mechanism took shape over a very long time. It has poisoned people's thinking, it propagates and will continue to propagate itself. Bureaucrats invariably present personal failures as failures of restructuring. This is a very serious and harmful matter. The opponents of restructuring are defending the system which has enabled people without talent or skill to occupy leading posts and to bring life down to their own level. No matter how difficult this may be, no matter what obstacles may arise, we can only proceed in one direction—we can only proceed forward and we must do it resolutely. Our press has cited the following figures: Over the past decade we have lost 25-40 percent of the fertile chernozems, the soils have become so clogged that they are not longer suitable for crop rotation. This is only comparable with being deprived of part of our homeland.

V.M. Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY Board, said: In reality the conference is already under way. Strictly speaking it started the day after the 27th CPSU Congress closed. As I see it, it is progressing in two main directions—the elaboration of the ideological and practical platform for the generalization of the experience gained over the past 3 years since the April plenum and the 2 and 1/2 years since the CPSU congress, and preparation of the conference in terms of the compilation of a program of expectation. What do people in the party expect from this conference, what hopes are they pinning on it? What does the population expect from it? What do our friends in the socialist countries expect from it? Our ideological opponents, too, are looking forward to this conference with expectation.

Everyone is familiar with our initiative in the sphere of foreign policy. But in a certain sense it is our internal affairs which constitute our most influential foreign policy in terms of the outside world. People are judging how far they can trust us in our foreign affairs according to our internal affairs, according to how steadily and consistently we implement the program approved for our internal restructuring.

M.S. Gorbachev: Restructuring has become a reality. It opens up the potential inherent in socialism and presents our country differently: both the people and the party. In general, the "enemy image" is collapsing.

Yet that is the basis of the entire concept of the propaganda struggle against the Soviet Union and its policy, domestic and foreign. We have proposed the new thinking as the basis for an enterprising foreign policy that invites everyone to cooperate. Yet they try to impose things on us, dictate to us.

V.M. Falin: I would like to support V.G. Afanasyev, who said: Just try, when you want to take a moment to fill a vacuum with something useful, try to get through to the obkom secretary, the republican Central Committee, the minister. We also spend 5-10 times more time on organizing a program for a good journalist than on the work of the journalist himself, because everything takes a long time to coordinate via the hierarchical ladder. The time spent is incommensurate with the actual result. A great deal of time, literally years, can be spent on resolving a trivial question, even on organizing a response on very critical and urgent questions.

The party should show the results of practical work, of its leadership of society, every day through constructive information about current events and phenomena. The mass media should have a specific common strategy for covering the whole period of preparation for the conference, the conference itself, and the subsequent period.

There should be a strategy for covering questions of history too. There should not be competition, especially among individual press organs—who can write most trenchantly about something in the past. Here too we need coordinated efforts, harmony in our actions. And finally, it would help the cause greatly if work on the textbook of party history and other documents was accelerated.

It is necessary to be honest always and in everything—that is a condition of the people's full support for the tremendous constructive work of renewing our life, K.Yu. Lavrov, chairman of the USSR Theater Workers' Union Board, said. He put forward a proposal to elaborate fundamental principles guaranteeing the immutability of the course of restructuring. That should be done without fail.

There are also the laws that have already been mentioned. And it is necessary to ensure that they operate not half-heartedly, but at full strength. That is the guarantee of steady progress. I would very much like those people who have demonstrated their commitment to restructuring in their lives and deeds, the speaker said, to go to the party conference without fail, and conversely, the people who resist it, who retard its progress, should not be at the conference.

M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade spoke of the masses' role in restructuring. Noting the working people's heightened activeness throughout the country, he said that the opinion is still current among some people that restructuring can be carried out "from above"—by the efforts of the apparatus.

Yet the main peculiarity of restructuring is that it cannot be implemented without the participation of millions of people. That is why the PRAVDA article was very timely. It prompted such a reaction, an explosion of public opinion. Today the most interesting thing in the newspapers is people's letters, how direct and frank they are. They are evidence of the irreversibility of the restructuring.

That is the most important political lesson, the lesson of such enormous trust among people on the threshold of the party conference.

I believe that so far we have done only poor work in uncovering the nature of the stagnation period, and we must do this. After all, here is the answer to the main question: that society, the country, has no alternative. Everyone must understand that.

I believe it is also necessary to state clearly at the party conference how far that stagnation period deformed us: the moral atmosphere and the spiritual health of young people. It is not easy to overcome the social passivity, lack of responsibility, and habit of waiting for orders from above, which leads to unthinking obedience—phenomena which were formed over the decades. But we must overcome these phenomena. Otherwise there can be no progress or development of society.

It seems to me that we now badly need a major discussion about the party. There is to be a party conference, and I believe that a wide-ranging, serious discussion of the substance of the matter has not yet begun. It is not to be seen in the newspapers. The opinion is emerging that the party apparatus is keeping quiet, and some people conclude that it is not doing this by chance, that it has nothing to say, or does not share in the changes. I believe that a discussion about the party and its role in restructuring is simply essential today.

The impression is created, G.N. Seleznev, chief editor of the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, said, that Communists and nonparty people, Komsomol members and perhaps even Pioneers, veterans and young people—everyone is discussing one question: what we are taking to the 19th all-union party conference.

Today not only at meetings, but also in the editorial offices' mail a great many questions are raised, big and small: How will our democracy develop, what path will we take, what is socialist pluralism? And I am sure that this curiosity on the part of young people must not be stopped, we must not silence those who ask searching, tricky questions.

We can see from day-to-day practice that young people are actively involved in restructuring. A rubric has appeared in our newspaper which says: "Down to Work."

Yes, the value of concrete actions, deeds, is growing. We newspapermen did not expect the rubric "I Choose To Live in the Countryside," devoted to the far from easy life of villages in the Russian non-Chernozem, to lead to such an influx of people wanting to come to the countryside and help it. More than 100,000 people who would like to move to the countryside to live. And more than 20,000 young people have already moved.

All the same, the new settlers in the countryside are beginning to come up against all kinds of petty difficulties, although on the whole the farms prepare for their arrival. It is important not to give the young people any reason to be disappointed, which unfortunately has happened before. Way of life has always determined mood, and in the period of restructuring we cannot allow the people whom the country has summoned to help our Russian non-Chernozem to be disappointed.

I.K. Arkhipova, chairman of the All-Union Music Society Board, who then spoke, talked about the important role of culture in the process of transforming society. Our country, she said, has many splendid musicians. But on the other hand, a neglect for music can be seen. And it begins with children at the earliest age.

The activity of the All-Union Music Society should exert a marked influence on the country's musical life. Unfortunately, as yet the mass media report little about the society and its affairs.

The cultivation of a harmonious personality is a very important problem. And it begins in childhood.

Yet with us, preschool artistic education is left to its own devices, and music teaching in general educational schools is extremely badly organized. Unless we cultivate a love of good music in children from their childhood, of folk music, for instance, and patriotic songs, this gap will soon be filled by some kind of rock music or just plain bad music, which has now multiplied to an incredible extent.

In conclusion the speaker appealed to the representatives of the mass media with this request: Do not forget that the art of music is an important, ideological art. It needs the constant concern and attention of society.

Glasnost is a powerful instrument of restructuring. It should be used in the most principled way, V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union Board, stressed in his speech. As yet, he believes, a one-sided approach is not uncommon. A newspaper or journal publishes an article containing sharp criticism of someone, but does not offer space to the subject of the criticism. I think that is wrong, the speaker said, this distortion must be rectified.

In this connection the idea was expressed that the participants in a debate in the press should enjoy equal rights to a reply argument. According to the speaker's idea, that would make the mass media select and check their facts more carefully.

In our society, A.D. Salynskiy, chief editor of the journal TEATR, stressed, the powers and potential of the human personality are not fully revealed. His will, his labor, his hopes. Under socialism, you would think it would be like this: All man's potential—his gifts and talent—should be revealed as fully as possible. But however, the old formula still operates, that was expressed by Gorkiy even before the revolution—in Russia, more people die of underestimating themselves than of consumption. Indeed, we often fail to realize how much is present in a

person, and the person himself does not realize it either. It is our social duty to reveal all this to the full. We cannot yet do this, because for many years the dogmatic principle prevailed among us, namely that the collective is always right. Nothing of the kind, by no means always.

An individual personality, a serious, profound, out-of-the-ordinary one at that, determines much, while the collective follows some kind of pattern, a well trodden path. In every worker, scientist, artist, composer, or rural worker, so many interesting reserves are present, and must be revealed.

In conclusion A.D. Salynskiy noted that the party conference will achieve success when it becomes, so to speak, a nationwide referendum in support of the ideas and practice of restructuring.

M.S. Gorbachev then addressed the participants in the meeting:

I want to thank you all, above all those who have spoken. I observed that all the others remained interested throughout in what was being discussed. Such meetings are very important to us, to the Central Committee, and it is good that we now have such a tradition. There are at least two points that could be taken up.

First, the party's leadership needs to consult you. A policy devoid of a scientific basis is doomed to vacillation and errors. We know this from our own experience. A policy not enriched by morality can cause, I think, no less harm. [This and following variations are reported by Moscow TASS in English at 1807 GMT on 10 May in a similar report on Gorbachev's address. Here the TASS report says: "A policy not resting on morality can cause, I think, no less harm."] And we are aware as well of what this has led to. This is why this meeting is important to us.

Second, I hope that the exchange of opinions offers a possibility for you, heads of ideological organizations, journals and newspapers, as well to check your tack and your approaches. For it is common reference points that we all need, especially in ideology and consciousness. I think that freedom always goes together, comrades, with increasing responsibility. The editors, the media executives bear vast responsibility at this watershed time when our society has found itself at a very crucial phase in its history. Every editor, of course, needs such contacts, such meetings, as they say, to check his watch. This is why I welcome this meeting once again.

You may rest assured that we take in the entire pluralism of opinions at these meetings with you. After all, it offers food for thought and the basis for understanding things better, for honing ideas and formulating them so as to realize them later in practice. I find it inspiring, for example, that our meetings are growing each time more substantive and the dialogue is getting ever more meaningful and profound. This is understandable, though, as perestroyka, too, has scaled new heights and acquired new parameters.

I said in my opening remarks that we wanted to devote this meeting to the forthcoming 19th party conference. Much is expected from this conference in our party and in our society indeed. Much is expected from our conference also by our foreign friends. Our antagonists are making their own plans and calculations. This probably explains the tremendous interest in our conference.

Very many people are anxious about the question of who will be elected to the conference, of who will decide on vital problems bearing on the fate of our society and of socialism.

In short, people are showing concern for the destiny of perestroyka. Even this by itself is very good.

The CPSU Central Committee has expressed its opinion on procedures for the selection of candidates for election as conference delegates. Our position is that it is committed stalwarts of perestroyka, active Communists, that should be elected delegates. There must be no more quotas, as were the case in the past, specifying how many factory workers and farmers and how many women are to be elected, among others. The principal political directive is to elect active supporters of perestroyka to go to the conference.

We expressed ourselves for the candidates to be picked out necessarily with the participation of party organizations and worker collectives and of party committees at district and city levels, in short, by all the people. Some regional party committees have decided to make the names of the candidates public in the local press even before the plenums that are to elect the delegates, so that they could be publicly discussed. This is just right, in our view. This will make it possible to approach the candidate selection from correct positions.

The CPSU Central Committee will keep the entire process of electing the body of delegates to the party conference in its focus of attention all the time. Some 5,000 delegates will be elected, or the same number that has been elected to the 27th party congress.

Comrades, we are positive that the line of the 27th congress is correct. The three years since the April 1985 Central Committee plenum have borne out that we have made the right choice.

How do we define the task for the conference? What is its concept? The conference is to make a thorough review of the progress of perestroyka and give it a further and strong fillip. The conference is to create the political, ideological and organizational prerequisites that would

not only guarantee the irreversibility of the processes of perestroyka and democratization, but also contribute decisively to unfolding these processes and furthering them.

We have entered, figuratively speaking, the boost phase of perestroyka. And we have been able to foresee that the second stage, these coming two or three years, will be very difficult. Strategy is being transformed into real policy, into real social processes and affecting all sections of society. We knew that we should expect a tension and that a new situation would emerge. Still—as it was pointed out correctly here—far from everybody has proven prepared for this. It is only natural, comrades, that the load on the party, on the cadre and on all society is increasing. This is evidenced by broader glasnost and democracy and by deep-going changes in the very basis, in the management system and in every aspect of society's life. It is as if doors had opened for us to a new and unusual environment. And it has proven vast and unfamiliar in many respects. We are covering new ground, like pioneers, and this means that we're making progress. Hence the varied reactions of people to the processes under way.

We knew: We should be prepared for this. Be prepared to think, act and live in a new manner.

In the Politburo we have compared notes and concluded that the novel nature of problems and the dimensions of new phenomena and processes at the second stage of perestroyka have put the whole party and its cadre in a new situation. We saw that far from everybody was prepared to view the present situation correctly. We found veritable confusion in the minds of many people—workers, intellectuals and administrators alike. And, let us be blunt, not only on the ground level, but also on the top. So the Politburo decided that the general secretary had to speak on ideological support for the second stage of perestroyka. I want to stress that everything that has been said on behalf of the Politburo and won backing at the February plenum fully retains its significance as reference points today as well.

I am telling you this because some people have indeed lost their bearing amid all these processes under way. Some people have failed to keep their heads and panicked. And the panic—and this is very serious—has taken the form of asking: "Isn't perestroyka coming to mean the wrecking and rejection of the values of socialism, isn't it giving rise to alien phenomena, isn't it destabilizing society?". I'll tell you that all these questions are very serious. And I wouldn't reckon those who have panicked to be irresponsible people or people opposed to perestroyka out of hand.

No, comrades, we should treat this seriously, without falling into another extremity, without branding everybody who has voiced some doubts as an opponent of perestroyka. And I am especially against the position of those who have put the "enemy of perestroyka" phrase into circulation in the press.

What does it mean, comrades? This sounds somehow ominous. This is the same as the allegation which has been floated through SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA that we are being threatened by the descendants of NEPmen and kulaks, and so on. Just think of it: 70 years on, they're trying to scare us with the descendants of NEPmen, Trotskyites and Dans [reference to followers of Menshevik leader Dan]. Let's rise to the occasion, comrades.

Through perestroyka, we want to restore Lenin's image of socialism and lead Soviet society to a drastically new level. We should really bring out the humanist potential of socialism—that is the task for perestroyka. But this means that at the second stage of perestroyka we should see the overriding goal—an updated society and updated relations among people in line with Lenin's ideas.

We should work towards this end by using methods marked by humanity, trust and respect. This does not mean lack of principle, any eclecticism or reconciling the irreconcilable. No, it doesn't. We should restore the genuine, wonderful meaning of the great word "comrade", restore the spirit of comradeship in the party and in society.

We cannot pursue perestroyka, which aims to upgrade socialism to meet the parameters of Lenin's thinking in the interest of the people, by practicing a free-for-all. We aren't after all destroying the social system or changing the forms of ownership. The soviets (elected governing councils) will stay put. Listen to Lenin: Socialism should be built with the human material inherited from capitalism. We are effecting perestroyka with people born under socialism. So should we renounce part of them, then?

No, we can't put the question this way. Our slogan is: Uniting and rallying society for perestroyka. This is the main thing, comrades. When it is essential, we should find out the root causes of these or other negative phenomena. This approach is proof of our confidence in the chosen path, in the chosen aims and in the chosen methods. And we have already identified them. This is precisely what, in my opinion, distinguishes perestroyka and makes it strong. We should all think it over in real earnest. This would be useful for us and, most important, simply indispensable, vital for us. I already said it in a remark here and I want to stress it once more: Both the party is at the service of the people and all the media are at the service of the people.

It is impossible to write of the people's destiny in a formal, bureaucratic, soulless way. Sometimes a true-to-life picture is presented, but the author writes in such a way as if the pain of the people is not sensed. And if there is no awareness of this pain, then epithets and metaphors

are used, labels are stuck, anything. This I repeat, happens, if the author does not sense the people's pain. And if this sense is present, if you remember your people always, if you write with an anguished heart of the grimmest things, then there will surely emerge something which in the long run will contain a lesson and optimism. For there will be a sense of involvement in the destiny of the people and the care that its life should be better. I am not going to teach you, I simply address your hearts and minds.

All in all, you, too, should reform. The media are an instrument of perestroyka. And in order to be an effective instrument they should undergo restructuring, just as the entire society. We say that there is no monopoly to criticism, that no zones are denied to criticism. But, hence, the press itself cannot be exempt from criticism. You should pose questions in a serious way, truthfully, in the interests of the people, socialism, restructuring. In this the press can count on the support of the party.

Why is conservatism so tenacious? This is another theme which I would like to discuss with you. What is it that feeds conservatism?

I believe that conservatism is the main factor impeding perestroyka. Establishing what it is that feeds conservatism should not be avoided as the answer to this question will help the party and the media to determine correctly the methods of overcoming this phenomenon.

We must defeat conservatism on the roads of perestroyka. Conservatism in part of society is nourished not only by dogmatic mentality, the habit of thinking in stereotypes, the fear of everything new, but also by egoistic interests. As to egoistic interests, this theme is raised by the press. It is shown that perestroyka pinches someone and they start resisting, hampering the process of renewal of society. But this is just part of the problem. The main thing for all society is still the need to overcome dogmatic mentality as it is something that a politician, a writer, a scientific worker have. It exists in all who are connected with intellectual activity and this largely determines theoretical analysis, the shaping of politics, etc.

There are stereotypes of thinking and action and they have a grip on a worker, an intellectual, a politician. This is a serious and profound phenomenon. We are all products of our time. We have conceived perestroyka and we also manifest many of the things that inhibit it. To reveal this, comrades, is a very important task of the media and, certainly, of the party and ideological work. Such a treatment of this subject helps man make a revolution in his own thoughts and determine his stand.

Indeed, conservatism quite often stems from egoistic interests. But will anyone mount the rostrum now and say he will write in a letter to a newspaper, that he raises some or other problems in order to save his present positions and preserve what suits him very much? Not at all. His stand will be presented in such a way as if he were acting to the benefit of the people, for the sake of socialism. This is something to be seen and understood.

And, comrades, there is another very important aspect. We often label as a conservative a person who holds his own special point of view. But take a more attentive look and you will realise that he gets into this position for the reason that so far he has not learned how to work in new conditions. He just does not know how to work, comrades. This is quite commonplace now. And we see how difficult it is to learn to work in a new way when we have been acting for decades in the framework of methods of the command-and-administer system. Then should these people who have not yet learned how to work be regarded as adversaries of perestroyka, as inveterate conservatives?

A real process of perestroyka is conducted in society through concrete experience, through debates, comphrehension and realization of this process and changing positions with taking into consideration the renewal of our society. And these are important things. We give everyone a chance to adjust. We talk about this in conversations, in the press. But sometimes it is reasoned in the following way: Everyone has been given three years for perestroyka and that is enough. If you failed to reform, get out. But we, all of us, have not yet reformed. I shall say this outright that we have not yet reformed and are only doing this.

What is to be done now? What emphasis is to be placed in party work, in the work of the media? A correct idea was expressed here that though during perestroyka much is being done in all directions, the main thing—the life of the people, their wellbeing, their mood, the way they feel—should not be overlooked, comrades. It is not only material wellbeing, social environment, but also the way people feel, their dignity, that should be taken into consideration.

The main thing that is to be done in every area, including spiritual, is to overcome alienation which, deplorably, takes place under socialism when it is deformed by authoritarian-bureaucratic aberrations. And it is only on the roads of democracy, glasnost, on the roads of moral purification of our society that alienation, bureaucratism, formalism can be overcome. In this work we are aware of the vigorous involvement of the enhanced political, intellectual, cultural potential of the entire people.

We also feel the support from our intelligentsia, and this support is growing. How can restructuring be implemented without intelligentsia? The matter is that not only workers and peasants but also our intelligentsia played an important role in what has been achieved.

An atmosphere that would guarantee the successful holding of the party conference should be created in the party and in society. The merit lies not in being the first

to point out some or other fact or event and proclaim this the loudest. What is needed is that the media should raise vital problems. There already exists a history of perestroyka, difficult and complicated, which should be revealed. And when we address ourselves to the past, this has the aim of understanding better what we need now so as not to repeat the mistakes of the past.

All this should be done without undue sensationalism. I would like to say that a good sensation for us is the one that our people is waiting for and our adversaries fear. It is the success of perestroyka.

The further development of criticism, the widening of glasnost is a matter of extreme importance. [The Moscow TASS English version adds: "This matter has been resolved."] It is asked sometimes what the limits of criticism and glasnost are. We have resolved this matter in the framework of socialist pluralism of opinions. We are for broad development of criticism and glasnost but in the interests of society, of socialism, in the interests of the people. Waging consistently and resolutely the struggle against conservatism, rooting out everything that hinders the process of perestroyka we must no less firmly protect, popularize and uphold everything which promotes perestroyka, which is in favor of the country, of the people.

We need new approaches, new methods, new discoveries in asserting perestroyka. Let us recall Lenin's words: Do not try to resolve new problems by old methods. Nothing will come of it. Hence we must conduct the quest for new methods. And we conduct it in every direction—in the economic area, in the spiritual area, in science, in education. The mass media must help the people master new forms, new methods, new approaches.

At the February plenary meeting we set ourselves the task of grasping Lenin's concept of socialist society more profoundly in order to apply it creatively in the present concrete historic conditions. Note, creatively. It was right that when the theme of NEP cropped up, it was said that we cannot copy, cannot repeat precisely the approaches of the past. No, comrades. We must study Lenin's thinking. It always provides many instructive things.

Consider, for instance, how Lenin acted in suggesting NEP. In the situation when the country was in ruin Lenin's resolute thinking, decisive policy were addressed to realities, based on realities. Therefore not everyone, not even Lenin's closest associates, accepted NEP at once. Lenin was accused of apostasy. It was thought he was pushing the country onto a road leading to ruin. So I say that we should address ourselves to Lenin's thinking instead of copying concrete decisions of that period. And there is room for new, off-beat decisions. This is natural. And it sometimes happens with us that as soon as an off-beat decision is made, there is an outcry: "Help, socialism is in danger, they are spawning private operators!"

Therefore I repeat that we should grasp Lenin's concept of socialist society in order to apply it creatively, taking into account the present conditions. What is needed is not just a return to the past. This would be the worst kind of Talmudism, dogmatic mentality.

We should get rid once and for all of the view of socialism as if it were levelling out, negating personality, of the notion of socialism as a certain minimum: the minimum of material benefits, the minimum of justice, the minimum of democracy.

We have a right to pose the question in the following way—realistic and serious: with the economic, intellectual and cultural potential accumulated over seven decades of our history, we should implement a contemporary model of society ensuring for all its members civilized living standards and multiform opportunities to meet spiritual and cultural needs, the freedom of choice and expression of opinions. But all this should be implemented in the framework of our socialist choice, in the framework of our socialist democracy and morals. This society will inevitably be more multi-layer, but it will remain socialist and it will not forgo the principles of social justice, comradeship and internationalism in the slightest. Why do I mention this? Generally speaking, our entire society is for socialism.

The point is that we are now faced with the task of the renewal of socialism. All of us, comrades, should realize what socialism is and by what methods it can and must be built, renewed and improved. This is the theme on which one should think and work. We should advance our traditional notions of socialism to the level of contemporary demands, so that they should keep abreast of the present day and the future of science, economic, scientific and technological progress. In short, we should restore the revolutionary character and historic perspective to socialism. Perhaps, it is necessary to establish the criteria of socialism for as soon as some advance is made and some new features appear, the question arises: Where are we moving, are we not moving away from socialism?

It is necessary to determine these criteria. What is truly socialist and what is alien to the very idea of socialism? It is necessary to rid socialism of everything pseudosocialist, distorted and deformed in the period of the personality cult, command system, stagnation, and restore the truly Leninist sense to socialism. And the role of the media in this cannot be overestimated.

We need that; without that we cannot go to the conference. We cannot do that without a clear idea, without drawing a picture, as it were, of the society for which we strive. We, certainly, should do this work with the greatest responsibility. I will say again: We should look for answers to the objectives of perestroyka within the framework of the socialist choice.

And let no journal, no newspaper urge us onto another path, by referring to the diversity of views.

Socialism in Lenin's interpretation makes it possible to ensure a pluralism of views, a pluralism of interests and of requirements, and to ensure that these interests and requirements are met.

We are going to the conference, which means that we must give an account and sum up the results. We must have more discussions at the conference already on the history of perestroyka proper. Accent shall be laid on summing up the results. And this is to be done from the standpoint of self-criticism: what has been done, and wherein our weaknesses lie. Then we will be able to outline the perspectives better. It is necessary that the conference be more businesslike.

The time has come to lay even greater emphasis on the question of the unity of word and deed, on the decisions taken and the course of their implementation. We have taken very important decisions which shall ensure a serious change in the structural policy towards the light and food industries, the social field. All this should lead to improving the living standards of the Soviet people. The implementation of the decisions on questions of scientific-technical progress in the field of machine-building and electronics is designed to ensure an acceleration of our advance, attainment of new parameters of labor productivity and the quality of products.

And now on how things stand today. In 1987, our gross national product grew 3.3 percent. The growth of the volume of industrial output was 3.8 percent.

Over the three years from 1985 to 1987 the average annual growth rates were: national income—3.3 percent, the gross national product—3.9 percent, industrial output—4.2 percent, the output of consumer goods—4.7 percent. The gross agricultural output in average annual count grew 1.9 percent, the commissioning of the fixed assets—3.5 percent, of housing—3.6 percent.

We have made progress in the output of commodities; progress has also manifested itself in health protection and public education.

The creative forces of the society have been set into motion. Positive tendencies are appearing. This is exactly what changes life. And this should effect a change, if we develop these trends in the right way.

Take, for example, labor productivity. From 1981 to 1984 we obtained 86 percent of the national income due to it. From 1985 to 1987—96 percent. In 1987 the whole increase was ensured through labor productivity. In the first quarter of this year labor productivity in industry grew 5.4 percent, including at enterprises working on conditions of full cost-accounting and self-financing—6.6 percent. In the building industry this growth was 8.9 percent, and of those who work on conditions of full cost-accounting 9.8 per cent. This is, comrades, serious progress. If we keep up this trend, I believe that many things will change for the better.

Here is an interesting fact. In 1985 the renewal of machine-building products was 3 percent, and in 1987—9.1 percent. This is a three-fold increase. We set ourselves the aim of achieving the 13 percent mark. Contract discipline is heightening. Cost-accounting is beginning to produce its fruit there too. The positive trend is making headway, overcoming the natural difficulties involved in transition to cost-accounting, to new economic standards, state quality control and many other things, which fundamentally renew our production field.

Now what we eat, what we are short of? Above all meat, fruit and vegetables.

The situation with the foodstuffs is a source of concern for us, of much concern. We should look for more cardinal measures to advance towards resolving that problem faster. It is necessary to stock the shops, public catering, the market and cooperative trade with enough foodstuffs.

Now about housing. Over the three years ten million families have bettered their housing conditions. This is a considerable growth. We had no growth in housing construction for several five-year-plan periods.

Now about the trade turnover. It has grown 13 percent. And it is apt to note, that over the past three years the sale of alcoholic drinks has declined by more than a half.

The growth is evident, but the shortages are evident too. This means, comrades, that we must have by far more of everything, of everything including the services, but their volume is insufficient. There are enormous potentialities for cooperatives in that field.

Every year the country's population increases by two and a half million. This dynamic should determine the growth of production rates of foods and commodities.

We are at a difficult stage in the economy, a very difficult one. We are introducing the reform, enhancing state quality control, mastering cost-accounting. A half of the country is run on cost-accounting and the other half not. This is, indeed, an unusual situation. To rectify the errors a decision is now being prepared on state orders.

Such are, comrades, the realities of perestroyka. I would ask you to show more competence in covering the perestroyka processes whatever fields they may concern. This takes profundity, responsibility and a well-balanced attitude. While criticising conservatism and shortcomings we should most actively support everything that is progressive.

In general, comrades, we should raise all of these questions both at the stage of preparations and at the conference itself from positions of principle.

We have what to tell the conference, both regarding the results and regarding the further perespectives.

We should come to the conference with major proposals concerning our society's political system, which is also in need of a fundamental restructuring.

We should comprehend the role of the party as the political vanguard at the current stage. We do not give up Lenin's concept of the party as the society's political vanguard. We believe that at the stage of perestroyka, the party's role further grows in the perfection of the socialist society, in carrying out far-reaching transformations. This necessitates from it that a science-based policy be outlined on the strength of correct appraisals and forecasts. This necessitates a large volume of ideological and organizational work.

Only the party equipped with the methods of science-based Marxist analysis can cope with this task. Therefore far from questioning the guiding and leading role of the party, we believe, on the contrary, that we should comprehend it more deeply. This role should, undoubtedly, be a different, a weightier one, precisely in the terms which I am speaking about—regarding carrying out the functions of the political vanguard.

In that connection the question arises about dividing the functions between the party, the soviets and the economic management bodies. A mixing of the functions resulted in a situation in which the party has taken upon itself many economic matters and began resolving specific issues, down to day-to-day ones.

This brought about a weakening of the functions of the political vanguard. On the other hand, this has resulted in a decline of responsibility both of the soviets and of the economic management bodies.

We should reappraise also the structure of the party machinery. This will uncover the enormous potentialities inherent in our party. If we simultaneously do everything necessary so that every Communist should become more active, that every primary organization, all of our cadres start working more vigorously, then things will start moving. We are planning to table a number of proposals on that score at the congress.

And naturally, comrades, in connection with the reappraisal of the functions of the party as the political vanguard, the role of the soviets should be comprehended in a new way. It is necessary to enhance the role of the soviets, the significance of the work of the sessions of the soviets and the commissions of deputies. The activities of the Supreme Soviet should also be reorganized. We should all give enough thought to it.

We should come to the creation of a machinery, permanently functioning and democratic, that would contain everything necessary to ensure the irreversibility of perestroyka, an active involvement of the people in it, that would name most active persons for leading offices, be aware of the sentiments and make the necessary corrections in the work. If we fail to do so, comrades, the economic reform will get bogged down and other processes will also get bogged down.

If we take a closer look, we will see that the key to everything is through democratization, through drawing people into all matters. Therefore the aim of perestroyka is man and the means of perestroyka is a mobilization of the human potential. We will press ahead with perestroyka through that and naturally through the cultural field, through strengthening the spirit of the people.

We must complete the creation of a socialist legal state. Therefore we will also need a judicial-legal reform. And this shall also be formulated as an objective at the conference.

This is a major turn, comrades. We are now creating the prerequisites upon which our society will function for decades. This determines the measure of our responsibility today. Therefore when we are told that we are indecisive in something and are reproached for that, we say: No and once again no. The most costly mistakes are the political ones. The best results are produced by well-prepared political decision. In general, comrades, we wish the 19th all-union party conference to take responsible decisions, that would give our perestroyka new, second wind, and open for our society an even wider road of progress towards democracy, the road of socialism.

Role of Previous Party Conferences Examined

PM0905143188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 May 88 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev: "Party Conferences: From the 1st to the 19th. Following the Traditions of Bolshevism"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] The 19th all-union party conference is drawing near. As always on the eve of a major event which marks a definite milestone in the development of society, nationwide interest in the past, in the history of our party, and the key stages of its revolutionary struggle is mounting, and this is convincingly borne out by letters to the Editorial Office.

Partywide conferences feature as important pages in this history. Seven of them were held during the pre-October period, and eleven took place after the victory of the socialist revolution.

What role have they played in the life of the party, what is their significance in the establishment of the Soviet state, in military building, and in the strengthening of the country's defenses? Why, despite the legal status bestowed on them by party congresses and statutes, have no partywide conferences been held for almost half a century? This is discussed in the article which the editorial office presents here for readers' attention.

A Delegate's Credentials [subhead]

In the center of Moscow on Kutuzovskiy Prospekt lives a remarkable man who has been a Communist for more than 60 years—Lieutenant General Ivan Semenovich Anoshin, retired. He is remarkable not only because of the eventful life he has lived, but also because of his inexhaustible energy, his sharp wit, and his memory, which seems unaffected by his 84 years. His apartment resembles a museum; there is much that reminds us of the past, that takes us back to the twenties, thirties, and forties. Our conversation was also devoted to the past.

Ivan Semenovich unhurriedly takes a number of small bright-red squares of thick paper from a special place and passes them across the table—his credentials to the party forums he attended. Among them is also credential No. 0384, authorizing participation in the last, 18th, All-Union Conference of the VKP(B) [All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)], which was held in February 1941. Anoshin was elected to attend this conference as a delegate of the Bashkir party organization with a casting vote, as specified in the document. If you leaf through the newspapers of that distant period, you can find Anoshin on the photographs accompanying the reports from the conference which show the presidium. He was first secretary of the Bashkir party obkom and member of the VKP(B) Central Auditing Commission.

I was struck by the following detail. The credentials to the 18th and 19th party congresses show a picture of Lenin and Stalin. There is no such picture on the conference credential.

We remember from our history textbooks that some party conferences were compared to congresses in terms of their significance.

The 18th conference was one such conference, Ivan Semenovich says, in view of the importance of the questions it discussed, the decisions it adopted, and the role these decisions played in preparing the country to rebuff the fascist aggression, which was quite imminent....

Let us interrupt his account here to return to it later. Let us trace the logic of events. [passage omitted]

Facing New Trials [subhead]

The 11th Conference [1921] was the first at which Lenin was not present. After that, there were during his lifetime two more conferences which Vladimir Ilich also did not attend because of illness. At that time, the situation inside the party began to grow more complex. The Trotskiyists were seeking a revision of Bolshevism and imposing debate after debate. The stenographic records of the conferences preceding the last one reflect the acute and dramatic nature assumed by the party's struggle to uphold the Leninist strategy and tactics and the purity of the party's ranks.

The late twenties and early thirties, which are an embodiment of revolutionary fervor and of the enthusiasm of the builders of socialism, also mark the beginning of the establishment of the personality cult and of unjustified repressions. How did this affect the party conferences. Were the Leninist traditions of intraparty democracy preserved in their work and in the decisions they adopted? I addressed these questions to Doctor of Historical Sciences Leonid Fedorovich Morozov, a staffer at the party history section of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

[Morozov] Historically, the conference is one of the most democratic institutions of party life, one that is called upon to resolve current problems or problems which have unexpectedly arisen before the party. For Lenin, the spirit of party democracy and a free exchange of views were indispensable. He could not imagine the elaboration of the general line of the party without broad discussion, without a clash of ideas in which he featured as a brilliant fighter, polemist, and realist who took account of all difficulties and contradictions.

Here is a characteristic example. At the Seventh All-Russian RSDRP [Russian Social Democratic Workers Party] Conference [1917], during the nomination of candidates for the Central Committee, the candidature of Kamenev—who did not share Lenin's viewpoint on a number of fundamental issues—was rejected by a large group of delegates. Vladimir Ilich took the floor and said that Kamanev reflected the sentiments of certain strata of the masses, and therefore it was important to have on the Central Committee someone who would express these sentiments. And he concluded: "The fact that I argue with Comrade Kamenev has only positive results. Comrade Kamenev's presence is very important, because the debates I have with him are very valuable. Having persuaded him, with some difficulty, you know that in this way you are overcoming those problems which are arising within the masses."

The first conference after Vladimir Ilich's death took place in the same Leninist spirit. The party proceeded to develop forms of intraparty democracy and to strengthen the ties with the masses. However, by the end of the decade, by dint of the known circumstances, these traditions began to disappear.

[Kosarev] Back in 1919 at the eighth party conference, it was decided to hold conferences regularly, once every 3 months. At that time, the provision concerning conferences was introduced into the Statutes of the RKP(B) [Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)]. However, at the 17th party congress in 1934 it disappeared from the statutes. Why?

[Morozov] It seems to me that the answer lies in the fact that the Leninist norms of party life were gradually forgotten. A feeling of inner rejection of the collective discussion of fundamental party and state problems and of the methods of collective leadership had already developed in Stalin by this time. During the prewar years, key questions were, as a rule, discussed at best within a narrow circle at the Politburo. And even Politburo sessions were no longer convened weekly, as had been the case in the past, but once a month, or even once every 2 months. Between these sessions, decisions were adopted by means of the "questionnaire method"; that is to say, a list of questions to be examined was circulated and Politburo members expressed their views on these questions, or, more often than not, agreed with the opinion of the General Secretary. It has now emerged that lists of prominent party officials who were to be arrested were approved in this way.

Incidentally, the provision on conferences appeared again in the statutes at the 18th party congress. It was decided that they should be held to discuss pressing issues and also for the purpose of the nomination of new cadres, above all to the Central Committee to replace former members. I am convinced that this decision was dictated by the situation which had developed. Of the 139 members and candidate members elected to the party Central Committee at the previous congress, 98 were no longer alive by the 18th Congress (1939). It should also be mentioned that conference decisions on cadre questions, unlike all other decisions, were not subject to approval by the Central Committee.

[Kosarev] Nine years had passed between the 17th and 18th party conferences. Party congresses had become rare. During the Great Patriotic War, not a single party congress, not a single conference was held, and only one Central Committee plenum met. Was this a consequence of the grim times of war or an expression of the style of leadership?

[Morozov] The war played its part, of course. Nonetheless, during the civil war (1918-1920), in the face of enormous transportation and economic difficulties, when Russia was encircled by front lines, three party congresses and two conferences were held. I believe that to this question, too, the answer is unequivocable—it was due to the departure from Leninist norms of party life.

[Kosarev] Leonid Fedorovich, the last, 18th, All-Union Conference of the VKP(B) was held in February 1941. Why was it held? How does it differ from the other conferences?

[Morozov] In conditions of the sharp exacerbation of the international situation and a real war danger, questions pertaining to the development of industry, and above all heavy industry, were at the focus of the party's activities. By that time, substantial successes had been achieved in socialist building. However, by the late thirties disproportions—a worsening imbalance—in economic and sociopolitical development were becoming increasingly obvious. The causes were many. Back at the 16th party congress, the report delivered by Stalin extolled the "frenzied pace" of industrial development in an attempt to prove the feasibility of the fulfillment of the 5-year plan "in a whole series of industrial sectors in 3 or even 2 and 1/2 years," and insisted that the pace of industrial development must be further stepped up. "People who are babbling about the need to reduce the pace of our industrial development are enemies of socialism and agents of our class enemies," he emphasized.

Reliance on administrative-command methods and on "whipping up" the economy had an adverse effect on the state of affairs in many national economic sectors. The 1937-1938 repressions which hit industrial management cadres especially hard were one reason, and not the least important one, for the laggardness of industry. Serious mistakes had been committed in the planning of individual national economic sectors. Despite the fact that major appropriations were allocated to the accelerated development of the defense industry, mass production of the latest models of military hardware was getting under way only slowly.

The party Central Committee decided that it was necessary to discuss these important national economic problems at an all-union party conference. In practice, this was the first serious attempt to analyze and understand the contradictions which had taken shape by that time in the development of the economy. [Morozov ends]

Here is a quote from the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editorial published on the opening day of the conference. "...Our country's vital interests and the necessity to ceaselessly continue strengthening its defense call for a steady rise in labor productivity and increased production of a full complement of high-grade goods strictly on schedule. This task cannot be resolved without a struggle to ensure strict accounting for all material resources, a drive for thrift and economy in all sectors of the economic organism, and efforts to cut the cost of the management apparatus. It is necessary to put an end to inertia and sloppiness which are still quite common at our enterprises. It is impossible to tolerate dirt and dust in the vicinity of the latest machine tools because they spoil the expensive equipment and lower labor productivity...."

Now let us return to the house on Kutuzovskiy Prospect, to the apartment of Ivan Semenovich Anoshin, with whom our account began. Let us return to his reminiscences.

[Anoshin] We, the delegates, took a sober view of the situation. We understood well that war was very close. Nonetheless, to many of us the tone of the reports delivered by Malenkov and Voznesenskiy was unusual. Glaring examples of bureaucracy and arbitrariness in planning and of nonfulfillment and bungling were cited, and the culprits, ranging from people's commissars to enterprise managers, were named. Each one of us felt the responsibility of the moment and understood that in the prevailing circumstances, any other discussion was simply unthinkable.

I myself also spoke at the conference. The Bashkir Oblast party organization had rightly been rebuked in Malenkov's report for poor work in the leadership of oil extraction. An account had to be given. On the Communists' instructions, I expressed serious claims against the People's Commissariat for the Petroleum Industry, which had failed to provide the necessary assistance to Bashkir oil workers.

[Kosarev] Ivan Semenovich, but what was the atmosphere at the conference and around it? After all, by that time unjustified repressions had scarred the country. Most probably you failed to find among the delegates many old acquaintances, many people whom you had met at the previous party congress?

[Anoshin] It was not as simple as that. We know this now, we talk about the personality cult, and about the crimes committed by Stalin and his henchmen. There was no mention of this at the time. Much of it seemed quite natural; after all, the country was surrounded by enemies. The mistakes in the economy and in social policy, many people believed, were the work of internal enemies, of the party opposition. The noisy trials of the enemies of the people, their universal condemnation, the exaltation of one name—all this happened, of course. People did reflect on the tyranny and lawlessness even then, but few linked them with Stalin's name. [Anoshin ends]

Here is a quote from the Resolution of the 18th all-union party conference: "It is necessary... TO PUT AN END to the lack of planning, THE UNEVEN PRODUCTION OF GOODS [capitalization as published], and storm-tactics in the work of enterprises.... It is necessary to put an end to foot-dragging, to what is basically an opportunist attitude toward new equipment on the part of a section of enterprise managers, since this kind of conservatism hampers the further development of production and dooms enterprises to backwardness, to being left out in the cold, and undermines the country's defense might...."

The 18th all-union party conference was of great importance for the strengthening of the state economy, and it laid the foundations for the reequipment and rearming of the Army and the Navy. The results of the implementation of its decisions were fully revealed during the Great Patriotic War, which was only 4 months away....

The 19th all-union party conference, convened by decision of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum in accordance with the party statutes approved at the last party congress, will open in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses 28 June. The upcoming conference is another convincing proof of the reinstatement of Leninist norms in party life. The conference will analyze the results of the 3 years of life and work in conditions of restructuring and ascertain what positions our party and society have attained since launching the processes of democratization and initiating a radical economic reform. The tasks are great. Only an authoritative and, in its revolutionary nature, democratic party organ, which the party conference must indeed become, can cope with these tasks.

Trial of Sumgait Rioters Opens 11 May

Correspondent's Preview

PM1105135788 Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 May 88 p 3

[TRUD correspondent T. Kasumova dispatch: "Time Holds the Answer"]

[Text] Sumgait—Enterprises in Sumgait are working intensively and schoolchildren and students are preparing for examinations. Weddings are being celebrated and children are being born. Nothing seems to recall the recent tragic events which shook this young and, it would seem, so successful city on the Caspian.

But this impression is deceptive. You only have to visit labor collectives and talk to people to realize that the events of those days in February here did not and could not occur without leaving their mark.

"Even now, 2 months or so later, we are still asking ourselves the same questions," A. Mamedov, a fitter at the "Sintezkauchuk" Production Association and member of the enterprise's party committee, said to me. "How was it that we were unable to prevent the excesses in our city, this city of workers? Couldn't we have dealt the bandits and hooligans a fitting rebuff right away? Difficult questions. We hope that the investigation will answer many of them. But the main thing is that justice will triumph. Not a single criminal will escape punishment."

The same opinion was voiced by many of those whom I met and talked with recently in Sumgait. People of different nationalities, who themselves, like Albert Mamedovich, did a great deal to prevent the enraged crowd's wild rampage and who, at risk to their own lives, protected and rescued comrades, friends, and neighbors—all those who were threatened with misfortune—are awaiting with particular impatience the end of the investigation and the court proceedings, which will in full measure strictly and fairly render the culprits their due.

They are convinced that this is precisely what will happen because a large group of workers from the country's law enforcement organs—experienced, qualified, and uncompromising people—are involved in the investigation in Sumgait.

"We have a great deal of strenuous and responsible work here," I was told at the USSR Prosecutor's Office special investigative group. It is still too early to draw the final conclusions; time is necessary for this. But we can say in all certainty that the ringleaders and the people directly involved in the crimes committed were criminal elements, who managed to involve some immature, thoughtless, and, one might say, "hapless" young people in the mass riots. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against more than 80 people. Several cases where the investigations have been completed have been brought to court for examination.

First to appear before the court will be T. Ismaylov, a fitter at the Sumgait Tube Rolling Plant, born in 1967, who has been accused of premeditated murder, motivated by his hooliganism, and of involvement in mass disturbances. The trial will take place in the Sumgait Municipal Court building. It will be presided over by A. Klokov, member of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Court. Peoples Assessors N. Tsurkan and V. Shaldayevaya who are workers at Baku enterprises will also be participating.

"The events of the last 2 months have made a painful imprint on the heart of each one of us," S. Vartanyan, distinguished constructor at the No 2 House Construction Combine and member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, said. Despite my bitter thoughts about what happened in Sumgait, I am, nevertheless, profoundly convinced that it was not the two peoples confronting one another here, as some people would like to depict, but instead unruly bandits and hooligans, taking advantage of the situation to encroach upon the honor, dignity, and tranquillity of honest people. I say this with such steadfastness because I am wholeheartedly supported in this opinion by all the members of our multi-ethnic [internatsionalnaya] [construction] team. The criminals' upcoming trial and a just sentence against them will, I am convinced, help overcome as quickly as possible the enormous moral harm done to all Sumgait's inhabitants.

80 People Charged

LD1105043188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] A trial begins in Sumgait today. The most experienced staff of the country's law enforcement organs have been involved in investigating the crimes committed. Proceedings have been instituted against more than 80 people, charged with criminal offenses. The guilty people will bear punishment according to the law's full strictness for the enormities they have perpetrated.

It is not only the judges who are calling them to account, for where the criminals plowed their brutal furrow, an unhealing wound has formed, an appreciable split in the relations between two distinctive and ancient peoples, so that the reckoning is not only on the criminal scale, but on the human and moral scale as well.

Comment on Trial

PM1005204988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 88 Second Edition p 6

[Special Correspondents Z. Kadymbekov and A. Chernenko report: "The Truth Above All. Trial Opens Today in Sumgait"]

[Text] At the tall signpost bearing the name "Sumgait", we turn off the main highway and drive into the city along a tree-lined street. First impression: Its life is proceeding calmly and at a measured pace.

"In Sumgait right now, there has been a sharp reduction even in the number of petty violations of the law," Z. Gadzhiyev, first secretary of the party gorkom, remarks. "Order has been completely restored in the city. All the city's service sphere facilities, cultural institutions, and educational establishments are functioning normally. City ispolkom and enterprise resources have been used to repair the apartments of all the victims. However, many [nemalo] families which left the city in those bitter February days have still not returned home. Let us be precise: Over 1,200 work places at enterprises and institutions are still empty."

"They are being kept for those people who have not yet returned?"

"No doubt about it! And we hope, we are certain, that people will return without fail. Just as we are certain that justice will prevail and that those guilty of the excesses perpetrated will suffer punishment in keeping with the full severity of the law," the party gorkom secretary concludes.

"The most experienced staffers of the country's law-enforcement organs have been involved in investigating the crimes committed," G. Talybov, chairman of the republic's Supreme Court, tells us. "All their scrupulous work has been subordinated to one end: that of not allowing a single criminal to evade responsibility."

Proceedings have been instituted against more than 80 people charged with criminal offenses. But it is not just to the judges that they will have to account. For where they plowed their brutal furrow, an unhealing wound has formed, an appreciable split in the relations between two distinctive [samobytnyy] and ancient peoples. How much effort of mind and heart, how much time it will take to heal this wound. So accounts have to be settled not just on a criminal scale, but on the human and moral scales as well.

"I am an Armenian and I lived in Sumgait for 40 years," we were told yesterday by V. Tamraeyan, a Communist, a former cabdriver and now a pensioner. "In my view we have much to comprehend and understand. We have to investigate who it was who needed to sow enmity between the two peoples."

And it is difficult not to agree with this. And, evidently, the trial in Sumgait will permit us to answer these questions.

We speak with member of the Azerbaijan Supreme Court Albert Konstantinovich Klokov, who has been appointed to take charge of today's trial in Sumgait.

"The proceedings will begin with the examination of the case involving T. Ismailov, a fitter at the pipe-rolling plant. He is charged with involvement in the mass disorders and with premeditated murder with hooligan motives. As yet I do not deem it necessary to add anything to this. The indictment is not yet the conclusion reached by the court. Let us be more cautious in our preliminary assessments."

PRAVDA's readers will probably be interested to know what sort of person is charged with determining the truth in such a complex and, let us say it, unprecedented criminal case.

"First of all, I am not alone in determining this truth. I have very experienced people's assessors alongside me—welder Valentina Vasilyevna Shaldayeva and lathe hand Nikolay Filippovich Tsurkan, both of whom work at Baku enterprises."

"All the same, tell us a little about the judge himself...."

"Well, what can I say.... I was born a year after the war. I studied and then got employment as a lathe hand. Then I served with the Black Sea Fleet. Following my demobilization into the reserve, I resumed work. I graduated from Baku University and did some work with the legal profession. Subsequently I progressed from people's judge to member of the republic's Supreme Court.... To this day, the events in Sumgait cause me an agonizing pain in my heart. Because I grew up in the international atmosphere of Baku, where Russians, Armenians, and Azerbaijanis lived and are living shoulder to shoulder. Therefore I must examine this business as a citizen...."

"Does this mean that the court's conclusions may be influenced by a certain emotional state, by the moral stance adopted by the judges?"

"No. Emotions inevitably give rise to mistakes. The court has no right to this."

Dissidents To Request New Party 'Registration'

AU1005163588 Paris AFP in English 1614 GMT 10 May 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 10 (AFP)—Dissidents meeting here since Saturday have founded the first independent Soviet opposition party since the Stalinist era, and it will aim to set up a Western-style democracy, a spokeswoman announced Tuesday. Called the Democratic Union, the party stands for political pluralism, freedom of the press and of trade unions, and is against the KGB secret police, Yevgenia Debrianskaya told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE.

Seventy people meeting Monday in a Moscow apartment after police barred them from a villa in Kratovo, some 40 kilometers (25 miles) away, voted "almost unanimously" on the new party's campaign plank and on a "declaration" stating that it was a political party, Mrs Debrianskaya said.

Delegates are to meet again Wednesday to elect 21 members to a "central council of cooperation" which will lead the party, she added. Between 11 and 13 of them will be Muscovites and the others will be drawn from the provinces. A request for official registration of the party will be sent to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet next week, and copies of documents relating to the new party are to be given to journalists Friday at a news conference, the spokeswoman said.

Dissidents attending what she described as a party congress were still under strict police surveillance, but for the first time in several days no new repressive measures had been taken against them, she said. Police on Sunday detained some 60 people conferring about the party. Most of them had since been freed, Mrs Debrianskaya said, but several were still missing. Three of 16 provincial delegates whom police forced to return home had since returned to Moscow, she said. [passage omitted]

'Democratic Union' Seen as 'Provocation'

LD1005220288 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—Some Western media these days have reported the formation of a "Democratic Union" in Moscow.

In reality, what can be reported is a provocation by a group of persons led by Novodvorskaya and engaging in slanderous, anti-social activities which were exposed by a Moscow Television show on May 7.

Following numerous requests by viewers, the Soviet Gosteleradio committee in charge of television and radio broadcasting intends to replay the show on Channel One throughout the nation on May 13. The people will then be able to see for themselves who is who.

After Novodvorskaya and her associates were exposed as inveterate liars, they decided to stage a provocation with a political flavor, whose aims showed distinctly in a "Declaration of Principles" providing, among other things, for dismantling the system of soviets (governing councils) as a form of state power.

Owing to the blatantly anti-constitutional nature of the declaration, it touched off a sharp argument even among the group members themselves and prompted criticisms against its authors.

The demagogical slogans of the group attracted the attention of certain quarters in the West, who sought to misrepresent its members as expressing the opinion of the Soviet people.

In fact, however, the group is nothing more than a bunch of scandal-mongers deliberately smearing honest people and hampering perestroyka and efforts to foster good relations between people.

Some persons in the West would like to make maximum political profit on the provocative activities of people representing nobody. Or can there be a different explanation for the heightened interest shown in Novodvorskaya, Grigoryants and their ilk by individual Western correspondents posted in the USSR, whose contacts with self-styled "political figures" go far beyond the bounds of professional duties.

Speaking of Grigoryants: On May 9, traditionally observed by the Soviet people as the day of their victory over Nazism, he kicked up a violent row on a trip outside Moscow and has been sentenced to seven days in jail by the people's court of the town of Ramenskoye in the Moscow region.

This information is to the benefit of his Western fans, to the benefit of those who are reluctant to give up attempts at misusing the perestroyka drive under way in the USSR to further their own interests and who keep interfering in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union with this aim in mind.

Ukrainian Party Censures Rovno Authorities

AU1105120188 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 4 May 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"—boldface as published]

[Excerpt] **The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has examined the work carried out by Rovno Obkom to invigorate the working people's activity in accomplishing the tasks of restructuring.** In the adopted decision it was noted that, guided by the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the successive CPSU Central Committee plenums, the obkom took practical steps to deepen restructuring, and to engage the wide masses of the working people in accomplishing economic and sociopolitical tasks. People's initiative is developing, their social and labor activity is increasing, and this is helping to improve the national economic results.

At the same time, the Central Committee Politburo found that the obkom and many party organizations in the oblast were slow in eliminating formalism and obsolete methods of leadership, and proved to be unable to properly engage all the working people in the process of restructuring and to ensure positive changes in the main sectors of acceleration. Industry continues to develop on an extensive basis. Compared with 1986, arrears in supplies rose 1.6 times. Many labor collectives fell short of the plans for labor productivity, prime costs, and profits. Demand for consumer goods and services has not been met. Many enterprises have not provided conditions for efficient work. A number of collectives proved to be unprepared for work under the new management conditions. Party committees and basic organizations do not properly assist labor collective councils as they are being formed.

The obkom and the oblispolkom have failed to assume an enterprising and firm position in settling problems connected with the development of the social sphere. Annual allocations for this purpose amount to a mere 15-20 percent of all capital investments, but even they are not being fully used. Most schools are significantly overcrowded, and so are hospitals. Social inconveniences experienced by people adversely affect their moods and undermine their faith in restructuring.

Party committees are not properly restructuring ideological work, which still falls short of the requirements of the times. The main object of ideological influence is still not the specific person with his or her interests and needs. Public opinion and the working people's political moods are being studied in a superficial way. Passiveness and indifference have not been overcome in atheistic work. The oblast has the largest sectarian network, and there is no decine in religious practices. Drunkenness and moonshining are widespread, and the crime rate has not fallen.

The shortcomings noted can be explained primarily by the fact that the obkom has been slow in restructuring the style and methods of leadership, proved to be unable to steer the efforts of all party organizations toward brisk organizational work, and did not help these organization intensify restructuring. Rather tame efforts have been made to eliminate obsolete forms, command and pressure methods in leading, and to check technocratic attitudes. The decisions taken are at times voluntarist. Democratic principles and glasnost are being adopted in practical cadre work in a timid way. Questions concerning the reshuffling of leading functionaries and the reserve formation are frequently being settled without the wide participation of communists, and this practice often results in errors and miscalculations.

Many basic party organizations do a poor job of boosting the vanguard role of communists. Some of the latter are passive, violate labor and state discipline, and misbehave, but these facts are not always being evaluated in adherence to principles. The practice of seeking people's advice in settling important social problems has not become a rule in the activity of party and administrative organs, and too little effort is being made to promote democratic principles in the work of public organizations and formations. Comrades V.I. Lutsenko and A.A. Popik, obkom secretaries, do not set the tone in restructuring, and also the obkom first secretary, Comrade T.I. Panasenko, personally, is short of persistence and initiative.

The Central Committee has obligated the obkom to eliminate the shortcomings in leading restructuring, to concentrate the efforts of party, public organizations, and the soviets of people's deputies on developing the process of democratization, and on the wide engagement of communists and working people in ensuring the 5-year plans. [passage omitted]

Chernobyl Victims' Treatment Data Revealed

PM1105105988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 88 Morning Edition p 6

[G. Alimov report: "How Are the People of Chernobyl? Meeting Between French Journalists and Soviet Physicians"]

[Text] A group of journalists from major French newspapers and magazines, radio, and television have visited Moscow's No 6 teaching hospital, where the Chernobyl AES victims were treated.

Chief Doctor P. Zakharov and A. Guskova, head of the hospital's clinical department, answered the journalists' questions. And there were many of them—our French colleagues had first-hand information on the Chernobyl patients. So, what interested them in particular?

"How many people have been treated in your clinic?"

"We have had 115 patients and have examined around 400 others."

"How long was the average treatment?"

"Two-three months. Up to 1 year for the treatment of burns."

"What about the examinations?"

"Seven to eight days."

"How many people died?"

"Twenty-eight. And two killed during the accident itself."

"Have there been any casualties among the population at large?"

"In 2 years not a single instance of radiation sickness has been discovered among the population."

"Those patients who survived, will they have to see you again?"

"The schedule is twice yearly."

"It is said that a man who has undergone a bone marrow transplant loses his individuality. Is that so?"

"This is ill-informed nonsense. We do not assemble people out of building blocks...."

"Is it right, in your view, that people are still working at the station?"

"There is no threat to their health. Otherwise it would be madness. We are monitoring this rigorously."

"How many bone marrow transplants have there been?"

"There have been 13 with a further 6 embryo liver cell transplants."

"What was the range of doses for which a transplant was indicated?"

"From 600 to 1200 rads."

The French journalists met with two former patients of the clinic. Patient G. was diagnosed as suffering from third degree acute radiation sickness and radiation exposure of 450 rads, and patient D. was suffering from acute radiation sickness of average severity and a radiation exposure of 370 rads. Both have now resumed their normal life. They both have families—two children each. The journalists, it seemed, were not satisfied merely with familiarizing themselves with their case histories and with color photographs of the progress of their treatment. They even asked: What about the patients' love life? Patient G. answered:

"I lead a normal life in the full sense of the word. I think that answers your question...."

Then it was questions, questions, questions again.

"Can you tell us what was the greatest radiation dose received by a survivor?"

"Yes, 900 rads. That man is now in a sanatorium. He was given a bone marrow transplant but his body rejected it and regenerated its own bone marrow. His blood formation resumed 2 and 1/2 months later."

"What was the greatest radiation dose received by any of those who died?"

"It was 1,600 rads...."

I think that such press conferences are useful. There was not a single theme or problem on which the French journalists were unable to obtain explanations or commentaries. And that is considerably better than fuelling the various kinds of conjecture and speculation which abounded after the Chernobyl accident....

Lithuanian Nuclear Station Said 'Sinking'

PM1005145988 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 26 Apr 88 p 3

[Arkadijus Vinokur "Focus" article: "Sinking Nuclear Reactor in Lithuania?"—editorial note describes author as "born and grew up in Lithuania, where he also trained as a mime artist"]

[Text] In an article in DAGENS NYHETER (30 Mar), "The Polluted Environment in Poland Kills Babies," Magnus Andersson describes the catastrophic consequences of unchecked environmental destruction in Poland.

Sweden has another neighbor in its immediate vicinity—Lithuania. There, in the Ignalina region, there are two nuclear power stations of the Chernobyl type, but with a 50 percent greater capacity. We know this. What we do not know is that the power stations are built on unstable foundations. At present rumors are circulating through the Lithuanian people that one of the power stations is sinking and that it has begun to lean. People who have no knowledge of how news spreads in the Soviet Union can dismiss the rumors with a shrug of the shoulders, but I take them seriously.

First, the power stations were built in 1980-81, that is, in the Brezhnev era. At that time, socialist competitions were popular and the aim of these was to achieve the best results as quickly as possible and consequently win bigger bonuses, medals, and so on. In such competitions safety requirements and quality were ignored.

The results are all too well known.

Second, despite more open discussion of environmental problems, such as the acidification of lakes, the discharge of chemicals, the overfertilization of land, there is no discussion at all of the problems of nuclear power.

I would like to illustrate this with a quotation from an article by Henrikas Jackevicius, deputy chairman of economic planning in Lithuania, published in the newspaper MOKSLAS IR GYVENIMAS (Science and Life) 8 March. He writes:

"Let us not touch yet on the problems of nuclear energy." And he writes this in an article (Protect Man—Preserve Nature) in which he discusses environmental pollution!

Are the rumors true? I propose that Sweden should send specialists to Lithuania as soon as possible to find out—one catastrophe, one Chernobyl, is enough!

It turns out that I am not the only one who thinks like this. On Wednesday 6 April, Lithuanian television broadcast a program about Ignalina. In it, people in positions of responsibility working at Ignalina said that groups of foreign scientists, including geologists, are welcome in person to study conditions at Ignalina on the spot. We must seize this opportunity.

Is there anyone who is seriously bothered about this in Moscow? Despite reassurances that not more than two reactors would be built at Ignalina, soon a third reactor will be brought into service and a fourth is still being planned.

In Lithuania there are large chemical plants: In Jonava and Kedainiai, fertilizer is produced, in Mazeikiai there is an oil refinery, and in Akmene cement is manufactured. Around these factories levels of pollution 5 to 6 times the permitted level have been recorded. The oil-fired power station at Elektrenai discharges 91,000 tonnes of sulfur dioxide every year. In the last 2 years the number of deformed children has suddenly increased, as has the number of cases of food poisoning.

Agricultural products have been found which contain 60 to 70 times the permitted levels of various chemicals! The reason is that one-third of usable land is affected by serious erosion because of the exaggerated use of herbicides and by the precipitation of various chemical pollutants. [sentence as published]

An investigation into environmental crimes showed that 28 percent of these are committed consciously. For example, one of the cement-producing factories in Akmene has access to purification equipment made in West Germany and able to purify 98 percent of the factory's waste products. But the equipment is not used.

The reason is that by not using the equipment, energy is saved and in this way people receive bigger bonuses.

Some beautiful Lithuanian lakes can already be declared dead. At present, 1 million cubic meters of polluted water a day are discharged into rivers and lakes. Some 65 percent of this water passes through purification plants, but only 22 percent is purified in accordance with the norms laid down.

"Who is guilty of all this?" The question is phrased in the spirit of Soviet journalism and of socialist justice. It used to be asked when one was forced to hide the most important reasons for a multitude of economic and political failures—dictatorship and centralization with the consequent absence of personal responsibility.

But now, after reading the Lithuanian press, I see that things are changing. The newspaper LITERATURA IR MENAS (Literature and Art) reports that an open party meeting took place at the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences between the Lithuanian Writers Union and scientists.

At the meeting, one of those involved in the debate, Ruta Gajauskaite lecturer at the Institute for Industrial Sociology [Institutet foer Folkbruk (Naeringsliv); literally: Institute for Popular Customs (Industry)], described the very low level of competence of many specialists. Among the people taken to court for ecological crimes 15 percent were ordinary workers, 45 percent engineers, and 25 percent lower- or higher-ranking managers. Her conclusion was that about half of specialists in industry do not come up to professional standards but are "illiterates with diplomas."

And what about nuclear power? This was not touched on at this meeting either. In my view, the reason is that nuclear power questions are all under the Soviet Union's Nuclear Power Ministry in Moscow. It is there that it is decided where nuclear power stations or other projects for energy supply are to be built. Its decisions are almost impossible to change. But there is an example of one such change.

In the Kirsiu Haffs area in Lithuania, small quantities of oil were found. At the central level, a decision was reached that the project to exploit the oil be carried out even though it was economically unfavorable. The production of oil would also have destroyed the wonderful countryside, the fish, and the water. The fight against the project was begun by the public (!), artists, writers, and finally the Lithuanian Government became involved. The project was halted last year.

Are there plans to do anything about the current destruction of the environment? Yes, there are plans. There has never been any shortage of plans in the Soviet Union. The problem is that they have no base in the system that exists in the Soviet Union.

There is no economic support for environmental measures, no responsibility, and no will. And no account is taken of what people on the spot think.

Will things be different in the future?

The prerequisite for this is not only the decentralization of the decision-making process where each republic in the Soviet Union decides its own economic and environmental politics for itself. There must also be a positive basis for open discussion and the possibility of expressing one's worries without the fear of punishment. Taboo areas are of no benefit to anyone.

Weekly Prints Letters on Delicate Themes

PM0905104188 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 May 88 p 14

[Readers' letters carried as part of an "International Department Mailbag" feature—first two paragraphs are a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA introduction]

[Excerpt] Here are three "new style" letters. All three are on different topics. The letters boldly intrude in spheres which were until quite recently considered the monopoly of the "chosen" and the "initiated," and they successfully prove that in a free society there are not and there cannot be any questions that cannot be discussed.

Of course, the authors could be faulted for excessive sharpness, imprecise reasoning, or some partial errors. It would have been easy enough to write a lengthy and considered commentary on any one of these [illegible] and to dot all the "i's" as it were. But we decided to do neither. Impassioned interest in the solution of burning social problems is more important than faultless analytical accuracy. As for accuracy, we will strive to achieve it with the help of all LITERATURNAYA GAZETA readers, through joint efforts.

Fragments of the Evil Troll's Mirror [subhead]

I went into a small restaurant in Vienna last January. As soon as the young cooks learned that I was from Moscow, they hastened to ask:

"Are you from the KGB?"

"Yes. I am on a special mission to steal the secrets of your cuisine," I joked although I did not feel like laughing.

"It feels strange being able to invite a Soviet person to visit and to chat with him, informally, around the dining table, about everything under the sun," people in Austria told me and they looked at me in amazement, as if I were an extraterrestrial being that had jumped out of a flying saucer.

When I spoke with pride and joy about the changes back home, about the gains by glasnost, about the fact that we are cleaning the poison of lies and fear from our own wounds, the Austrians were perplexed: "You say all these things and are not afraid to return home?!"

"How do Muscovites spend their free time?" I was asked.

"In the same way as you. We visit people, go to the movies or the theater, take trips out of town."

"Really?!" My interlocutors were flabbergasted, while I still felt like an extraterrestrial being. And this was happening in Vienna, from where people used to travel to Bratislava for a glass of beer in the evening, and which is, after all, just a stone's throw away from Moscow.

What do they think we are, I thought to myself. And I admitted to myself: They think we are what Stalin made us. Or rather what he wanted to make us. He did not succeed completely, but he managed quite well in some respects.

An elderly teacher described a nightmarish experience: She lost her Soviet passport while on a guided tour. While efforts were being made to find it, the poor woman almost had a heart attack. "I lived through the war," she told me, "but I have never before experienced such terror." "Why?" "I was afraid that I would be classed as a nonreturnee."

"Nonreturnee"—what sort of sinister word is this? It does not figure in the 1983 edition of the Academic Dictionary of the Russian Language, but it is a part of our memory and of our life. Otherwise why should people almost die of fear about their passport—unquestionably an important document, but just a document and nothing more? Being a Soviet citizen is a matter of honor, it is wonderful, but the motherland which everyone carries in his heart must not be confused with words written in ink on a piece of paper.

The country's rural population remembers well the time when passports were not issued to peasants so that they, like serfs, were rigidly tied to a specific kolkhoz. Only by obtaining a passport were rural residents enabled to freely travel around the country. In the same way, today our passport must become a symbol of emancipation and not a bridle reminiscent of Old Russia's census records [revizskaya skazka: reference to 18th-19th century census records listing the population by name].

After all, we are not living in vassalage. We are living in our motherland. Why is it that if a Soviet citizen decides to stay abroad longer than stipulated (by whom was it "stipulated," when, why?!) people immediately hasten to label him a "nonreturnee," which is only a footstep away from "traitor to the motherland," which is indeed the most terrible curse? Why should an anathema be pronounced upon those who would like to spend some time traveling, studying, or working abroad, especially when they do not use the state's money but pay their own way?

Who implanted in our minds this strange and inhuman idea that the desire to see the world and talk to people who are unlike us is heresy and sedition, and when was this idea implanted in our minds?

I think that this is also a legacy from Stalin's time. It is the virus of universal suspicion, a symptom of a monstrous persecution mania which made so many people suffer. These are fragments of the evil troll's mirror of fairy-tale fame, which broke into millions of slivers and they, lodging inside the eye, made people see only the bad and overlook the good.

There is an equestrian statue of Prince Eugene of Savoy in the center of Vienna, having only two points of support. The man who made this monument dies young from a brain disease. Legend has it that he was consumed by a mania which brought about his death. His fear was: What if the monument suddenly collapses?

It seems to me that some of our functionaries, who are in charge of questions concerning people's travel abroad, are consumed by an identical manic disease: What if he suddenly gets away, escapes, fails to return?! The fragments of the evil mirror are lodged in bureaucratic eyes more firmly than anywhere else.

Why is there such a catastrophic distrust of fellow citizens in our country? Why is it that when a Belgian decides to spend some time living in Vienna nobody in Belgium is worried in case he becomes a nonreturnee? Fine, maybe nobody needs the Belgian back home while a Soviet citizen is needed by the motherland. But why such distrust? Surely, by undergoing the most terrible trials which history liberally apportioned to us, Soviet people have proved that their patriotism is an inner need, a call of the heart and the soul, and not a matter of obedience based on fear?

There were times in the past when our society was reminiscent of an hermetically sealed submarine. We found out about events on the outside from the reports by the few who had managed to get near the periscope.

Our elegant Paris correspondent faced the television cameras and intoned in a funereal voice: "Paris is in the grips of an energy crisis...", against a background of city lights burning brightly in the night, and if we were to believe what the correspondent was saying we had to disbelieve our own eyes. In contrast to such convincing "propaganda" some people became convinced that everything "here" was bad, while "over there" tape recorders were growing on trees, just go and pluck them off the branches, and people would even thank you for doing it.

The chambermaid in a boarding house near Moscow proudly informed me recently that she was "using gold to cure a cold." It appeared that, by special request, some friends had brought her back a handful of sand from Bulgaria's Sunny Coast. I'd understand it if she had asked for some souvenir, but sand! Sand like the sand we have by the tonne on the Baltic coast or at the bottom of her hometown river. But for her it is "gold" because it is from abroad. And if someone had brought her sand from the French Riviera she would have probably eaten it!

Why is all this happening? Because we are talking about the forbidden fruit....

The famous Austrian satirist Bronner told the following story. A Hungarian acquaintance came to visit him some 20 years ago. "Pour me a glass of Coca-Cola," the Hungarian asked when they had sat around the table. "I've been yearning to try this drink for so long. I've always felt that it has the taste of freedom...."

Bronner poured the Coca-Cola, but the guest was reluctant to touch it. "What's the matter? Why aren't you drinking?" "What if it turns out to be not so tasty?..."

Let people try. It is necessary to get out of the submarine, to let people see the world for themselves, and they will themselves distinguish between the wheat and the chaff. It happened with Pepsi-Cola. Now that we are allowed to taste it we have seen for ourselves that the formerly longed-for Pepsi, with its chemical taste and its sugar content which is enough to kill a horse, is much worse than, say, kvass or the Lagidze soft drinks from Georgia, made from pure spring water and natural products. These latter drinks, thanks to the entrepreneurship of the "Vinnitzky Gmbh" Firm, have now started capturing the European market.

I happened to be in Vienna on New Year's Eve. It appears that now it is very fashionable for Europeans to see the New Year in in Vienna. People in their thousands gathered on New Year's Eve in the square outside Vienna's magnificent St. Stefan's Cathedral. At one point I even thought that I was in Rome—there were so many Italians around me.

Yet, these tourists in their tens of thousands could come to Moscow to see the New Year in—Red Square is no less attractive that Stefansplatz, and there is actually much more room in it. And on a worldwide scale, our country's popularity is equal to any other country's. But we are unable to take advantage of this popularity. The "mercenary yellow press" is not the only one to blame for the fact that foreigners still think of us largely as "far-off Russia." We tell them very little about ourselves. Very little, and largely in officialese.

Let people travel. Not only from the West to us, but also in the other direction. The task of economists is think up ways to make such travel advantageous for the motherland. Obviously, the most important way would be to attract more foreign currency to the USSR. We have many resorts and plenty of unique localities to attract Western tourists—just open them up, create modern facilities, advertise. Modern tourism does not and will not produce anything but mutual advantage.

Recently, and at long last, the rules governing Soviet citizens' travel abroad were considerably relaxed. Sooner or later—and the sooner, the better—the follow-up steps will also have to be taken.

[signed] Natalya Daryalova, Moscow.

"God Forbid We Should Lose Our Products Range..." [subhead]

I was prompted to write this letter by something that actually happened. At the time when the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles was being signed, my laboratory colleagues and I were exchanging opinions on the news from Washington. Suddenly the chief uttered a sentence which stunned me:

"God forbid arms reduction should go any further...."

"Why?"

"The plant will lose one-half of its products range," he explained pompously. He appears to be a normal person, one of those of whom it is said: "All Soviet people unanimously approve...." He would apparently approve even now, but he went on to add: "Think of what it would mean for you personally, you get dismissed as a result of production cutbacks caused by disarmament, what then?"

"That would be the happiest day of my life."

I am afraid that the chief found my words rather too fine. He did not believe them, people have stopped believing in fine words. Tell them: "I want to eat, to sleep, to buy...", and they'll believe you, but if you tell them: "I want to live in peace, I want to do some interesting and honest work," and they'll either disbelieve you or take you for a weirdie.

Journalists today have all taken up arms to struggle against the enemies of disarmament in the form of the West's military-industrial complex and the promoters of its interests in politics. It seems to me, however, that it would not go amiss to have a look also in other directions, especially in the direction of the strictly reliable rear. Oh, what a seditious idea, but after all we too have our own military industry, and not a small one either.

The press eagerly cites figures about the number of schools for U.S. children that could be built instead of one submarine, about the number of sick Americans, Britons, or Frenchmen who could be cured if another (and actually unnecessary) fighter aircraft were not produced, and so on. But our own children and our own sick have an equal if not greater need of brand-new schools and proper treatment. It is generally known that labor productivity in the United States is higher than ours not "by so much" but "by so many times," and the correlation of industrial output volumes is no secret, either. The blunt logical conclusion is: Military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States will cost us much more than it would cost them.

Meanwhile, military parades and the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program show our fighter aircraft, aircraft carriers, tanks, and missiles which are so beautiful, so exquisite, so impressively mighty as if each one had been

handcrafted especially for the sake of being raised on a pedestal. But each one of those handcrafted machines can also be expressed in terms of schools for our children, hospitals for our patients, apartments for our homeless. People must know the truth, especially since, apart from anything else, our prosperity is not as high as we would like it to be.

"God forbid that missiles should be cut back—we'll lose the products range...." But can anyone be amazed at such a reaction? Society's prevailing immunity to slogans has now extended to peacemaking slogans too and it prevents man from perceiving the future advantage of disarmament—the opportunity to lead a more confident, more dignified, and richer life. To get away from the psychological paths that have been trodden over the years—this is something else we must learn, and the learning process will not be accomplished overnight.

What am I calling for? To unilaterally shut down the entire military industry and convert it at once to the production of toys and kitchen utensils? Nonsense, of course. Ultimately, in the conditions of a socialist economy, the planned conversion of enterprises will pose no particular problems. In my view, the really serious problem is the mental conversion and inner preparedness of people to sacrifice something, to give up something for the sake of universal interests and needs. To close one's eyes to this problem is flippant and not in accordance with the spirit of the time.

I would like to find out what LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's readers think about this.

[signed] Sergey Sukharev, engineer, 25 years of age
[passage omitted]

KOMMUNIST Issue on Restructuring Described

LD0505144988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1040 GMT 5 May 88

[Review of issue No 7 of KOMMUNIST, presented by Irina Chirkova]

[Excerpt] Today one can find the concept of the mechanism, or the force, of braking restructuring on every page in the papers. My colleagues consistently and painstakingly seek the specific sources and origins of them, and sometimes delineate whole social groups who, in their opinion, are holding back the processes of renewal in our life.

The publication of issue No 7 of KOMMUNIST magazine will help those who are trying to sort out, first and foremost, the reasons for the emergence into the light of these forces, and the source which nourishes those anti-restructuring forces going under the name of dogmatism—dogmatism as a type of thinking which presupposes systematic and organized uniformity of thinking. I think the word will seem distinctly unwelcome to you, it pains the ear, but I would find it difficult to find a more precise one.

Every issue of the magazine enters into battle with those who are conduits for uniformity of thinking. Putting it in Lenin's words, one is convinced that someone is right not by dint of power, but by dint of authority, of energy, greater experience, greater flexibility and greater talent. The set of problems connected with rethinking the style and methods of our propaganda, and the whole ideological sphere in general, was put up for discussion by the editorial staff of KOMMUNIST at a roundtable for party workers, economists, scientists, a writer, a director and an actor. Here are participants in the conversation at the editorial offices, which opens the 7 may issue of KOMMUNIST. Here we present Igor Aleksandrovich (Dedkov), the magazine's political commentator.

[Begin Dedkov recording] In March and April we saw this exacerbation of the ideolcgical situation, and quite evidently there was, one can say plainly, an open clash of ideologies, which we call the ideology of conservatism and the ideology of renewal. The roundtable which took place at KOMMUNIST was, in fact, connected with this clash, and with throwing some light on the positions. The participants in the roundtable, people of different professions, different occupations, different views, simply tried, each using his own material, to define his position in the current situation.

I think that what we call the ideology of conservatism feeds on a number of myths, and I would like to reiterate some of the myths. There is the myth that real socialism existed in our country under Stalin, there was real socialist order, and everything that has happened afterwards has been a retreat from it. Hence the nostalgia for that order. Another myth is that the Russian people, in particular, worships strong authority, a strong hand, and so, naturally, the fact that there would seem to be no strong authority, no strong hand now, well, that makes the people unhappy, and so it should be revived; that's another myth. And the third myth is that we all—not just the Russians, but all the peoples of our country—owe our victories and successes to the great Stalin. And, it seems to me that these are the three myths on which the ideology of conservatism is built.

I don't have the opportunity to criticize it in more detail now, but I would like to point out one feature of this ideology: The fact that it stems from some very profound lack of respect for the people. You know, although this is, as it were, widespread among the people, at the same time, it is linked with some kind of feeling of self-abasement of the people, and of disrespect for the people. Apart from this, it is also to a large extent founded on historical illiteracy which has become very

widespread, and these myths are a fruit of this illiteracy. And the whole ideology of renewal and restructuring is based, first and foremost, on knowledge, on freedom of thought, on people being convinced, and while the ideology of restructuring stems from faith in the capabilities of the people and from faith in the people's initiative, the ideology of conservatism relies on contempt for the people; it views the people as some kind of construction material for the foundations and for pedestals, you see, and so I think it is doomed in the historical sense. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Economic

Stalinist Theories, Resultant Problems Examined

PM1005141688 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Candidate of Economic Sciences Tina Dzokayeva article under the rubric "Pages From History": "The Last Sacrifice: An Economist's Notes"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] These notes do not claim to be a study of the history of one of the social sciences—the political economy of socialism. The author's aim is to take an unprejudiced look at the lessons of the economic debate of the early fifties and at the methods of resolving scientific disputes that I. Stalin used. It is well known that, unaffected by doubts, he assumed the role of supreme arbiter in deciding the future of many sciences. It happened with genetics. It happened with linguistics. It also happened with the political economy of socialism.

Doubtless not many people have kept these two books together. A neat, claret-colored publication. On the cover is a famous profile with a mustache, framed by a laurel wreath. A signature tooled in gold: I. Stalin. And also in gold—the latest title in the long list of his works: "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" ["Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Sotsializma v SSSR"]. The date of publication—late 1952. This elegantly made book, of which only 10,000 copies were published, was addressed to the participants in the economic debate. This was the debate about the draft for a textbook of political economy in November 1951. In the book, Stalin summed up the results.

And now the other book—the first textbook of political economy, which was the result of the debate. The foreword is dated August 1954 by the distinguished authors. What a turning point in time—and not only in time! The man who inspired the textbook's appearance—the man in the laurel wreath—is no longer with us. But the epoch still bears his name. This book is a kind of epitaph for the deceased. The last sacrifice to him.

Today everyone can see what is wrong with economic science—its remoteness from practical activity, abstract, scholastic arguments in a language that even economists can only call "jargon." Not much thought, and therefore no suitable words. The fault is visible on the surface. But its origin, which was not accidental, is deeply buried. It might appear that in this science, people simply do not work hard enough because of their inadequate capabilities, do not extend their research as far as the resolution of practical tasks.

But there is something else that lies behind the fault. That is what I want to talk about, to the extent of my professional abilities.

Many sciences suffered a bitter fate. Some of them we knew about before. Others we have learned about recently. But economic science, one may say, still preserves its mysteries. Especially the one called "political economy." Let me observe that the very name has become unattractive, and therefore sounds ponderous. This fundamental science, once attractive and absorbing, has lost its former significance in many people's eyes. Especially when it comes to what is called "the political economy of socialism."

It was Stalin who formulated this modification of economic theory. Today there is not much point in recalling who shouted first and loudest about Stalin's latest contribution to science. That is not the point. What is more important is that today, although we no longer sing the praises of the "creator," we continue to serve him slavishly: The science is still the same.

From the very first the general mood of the post-October period influenced the fate of political economy. It was a kind of euphoria, a state of confidence that history was starting from a completely blank page. In whatever sphere: social, biological, or economic. At that time, many people wanted neither Pushkin nor Dostoyevskiy. We know how it turned out, for instance, for biology. But economics fared no better. This too was uprooted, the genetic codes binding history into a single, common process were broken off. "We will build our own world, a new world!" But how?

It appeared that the time had at last come for Engels' fine phrase about the "leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom." The opportunity to control society's life by efforts of will was deemed to be the "kingdom of freedom."

Against the general background of nihilism, authoritarianism in the guise of party commitment discarded one element after another of the economic science created by Marx. German Lopatin, that "martyr to an idea," would have experienced yet another bitter disappointment had he lived 1 or 2 years longer. The chapters of "Das Kapital" about goods, the quality of labor, and commodity fetishism, which he translated brilliantly into Russian, were the first to be forgotten.

Instead of the propoaition on the duality of labor—Marx described this as the most mysterious phenomenon, undetected for 2,000 years, and considered it his main

discovery—there was the sugary phrase about "the directly social nature of labor under socialism," an idea subsequently declared to be "a lasting gain of socialism's economic thought." In fact this phrase was designed to create the impression that socialism is an economic system entirely free from conflict. Of course, human relations ("production relations," in the terminology of political economy) were also declared to be so. Instead of the interweavings and conflicts of people's lives through social production (conflicts which, alas, are not simple even under socialism), a system was propagandized in which relations between people are "simple and transparent," and easily controlled.

It is not hard to imagine how this de-energized situation clashed with the Stalinist "theory of the exacerbation of the class struggle" as progress toward socialism continues, a theory which was being pushed at the same time. Many people who preached the idea of the "transparency" of production relations and their conflict-free nature tragically discovered through their own bitter experience the monstrous divergence between these sugary phrases and the harsh reality of the repressions. Among such people were Bukharin, Voznesenskiy, and Ordzhonikidze.

The natural regulators that govern an economic system in any conditions were increasingly disregarded, requirements such as the relationship between supply and demand, the supply of the finished product to the consumer, and so forth were ignored... Hence even more cuts in economic theory. Any new political economic topics were deemed superfluous to socialism: Thus advertising or credit forms of circulation were declared a bourgeois necessity.

But at the same time the theory of the "specific laws of socialism," first and foremost the law of the planned approach, was vigorously pushed. The "plan" as the expression of arbitrary command methods of management became the alpha and omega of the socialist economy. And thus of economic philosophies. In declaring it to be the main "specific law," they showed little concern for socialism's real need for a scientific system of organization of production.

Thus, a collection of new concepts was formulated. There was not much of it. And most importantly—what weight did these amorphous phrases have? They were feather-light. During the "debates," which culminated in more repressions, real economic concepts and levers disappeared. Economists were "educated." The pages of the journals were full of their "repentances" and self-exposures ("Yes, I preached bourgeois views, I repent"). They scattered ashes on their own bowed heads.

But how could real economic concepts stand firm in the conditions of the total triumph of arbitrary command methods of management? Was there any need for them?

In these conditions preparations proceeded for the official formulation of the main economic science. It was preparing to see the light of day. In 1936 a resolution was adopted on creating a political economy textbook. At the same time the "Short Course" in party history was being created. Stalin's creation. Nor, of course, did he let political economy out of his grasp. The creation of the "political economy of socialism," with a complete reshaping of economic science, was his last major act.

What role did Stalin assign to economic science? What did he want to invest in it? He answered these questions in "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR."

When they embarked on the debate that the book's appearance preceded, economists were already so downtrodden and intimidated that they seemed to be afraid of their own shadows. The experts in a science where the chief concept is "ownership" were afraid to utter that word, if it came down ever so slightly from the highest level ("social ownership") toward the specifically human level. They bashfully substituted some kind of colorless synonym like "use." This was so self-disparaging that even Stalin was forced to encourage them and "put them right." Many people now write that he managed to capitalize even on this. For instance:

"It would be incorrect to say in the draft textbook that 'every kolkhoz homestead has the personal use of a cow, small livestock, and poultry.' In fact, it is well known that the cow, small livestock, poultry, and so forth are not in the personal use, but in the personal **ownership** [boldface as published] of the kolkhoz homestead."

Thus Stalin gave his blessing and magnanimously allowed the introduction of the term "personal ownership."

But a paragraph later, he explained: "These details are of great significance for our foreign comrades, who want to know precisely what actually remained in the personal ownership of the kolkhoz homestead after the collectivization of agriculture was carried out in our country."

As for tractors and other agricultural means of production as property under the possible ownership of the kolkhozes (Sanina and Venzher, participants in the debate, proposed this), on this question there were no concessions or sops! Stalin accused Sanina and Venzher of scientific ignorance and "no knowledge of Marxism." "The main error of Comrades Sanina and Venzher," he write, "is that they do not understand the role and significance of commodity circulation under socialism and do not understand that commodity circulation is incompatible with the prospect of the transition to communism." Stalin branded the economists' proposal as "a profound error based on a misunderstanding of Marxism."

So here we find the roots of that tenacious disregard for the role of the commodity-money relationship: Such was the will of the "creator" of the political economy of socialism. Yet Stalin contrived verbally, in "theory," even to defend the commodity-money relationship under socialism. Which did not prevent him from orienting practical work toward the direct exchange of products.

Stalin's basic idea, and therefore the kind of economic science he sought, can be understood not only by reading the actual text of his work and his reasonings on the problem itself. The tone of his remarks is an extremely informative source. Behind the gold letters of the book's cover, the usurper of thought can be seen. What he really wanted can be judged by the force of the anger, the coarseness of the language with which he attacked economists who dared to submit comments and proposals. The part of the main character who finds himself in the most forbidden spot and breaks the rules of Stalin's game was played by Yaroshenko. An economist who submitted to the Politburo his comments on the draft textbook on political economy.

We students at the Moscow State University economics faculty were glad that our beloved teacher Aleksandra Sanina was perhaps not spared by Stalin, but at least not destroyed. Yaroshenko, however, was all but crucified. Pilloried, mocked, humiliated. So what did he do wrong? How did he arouse such wrath?

Yaroshenko's "sin" was that he encroached on the very subject matter of the science that was being created. That is, he called into question the range of questions assigned to the newborn science. God was angry when Adam dared to taste of the tree of knowledge. Yaroshenko committed the same sin. What he proposed, what he did not agree with, was not subject to discussion according to Stalin's plans, it contradicted the design by to which the science was being created before our very eyes, a science that was consciously abstract, projected up toward the heavens, remote from earthly concerns and economic practice. Stalin apparently sought a single goal—to force the newborn science into a nonexistent space. Political economy was charged with studying not the means of production, but only "production relations," without touching on the nature of production forces. That is tantamount to making a science out of studying the human world through people's shadows.

Thus the fault in political science that torments us to this day was laid down.

Yaroshenko expressed resolute disagreement with the truncated mission of political economy, judging from the extracts from his "Comments" cited by Stalin. "Comrade Yaroshenko claims," we read in "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR," "that the subject of political economy is not production relations, but 'the elaboration and development of the scientific theory of organization of production forces, the theory of national economic planning, and so forth.'" And later: "Yaroshenko, in his letter to the Politburo, asked 'to be allowed to prepare his own political economy textbook,' which would be based on that main idea."

Stalin attacked these two proposals with all the boundless force of his wrath and coarseness: "Never before has a 'Marxist' gone astray uttered such total gibberish... Comrade Yaroshenko... annihilates the political economy of socialism. Here he is in full agreement with Bukharin... he trudges along in Bukharin's footsteps,"—Stalin does not forget his victims.

He also mocked the request: "Comrade Yaroshenko's request to entrust him with writing a Political Economy of Socialism cannot be taken seriously, if only because it shows him to be as brazen as Khlestakov" [in Gogol's "Government Inspector"].

Another label!

The point is not whether Yaroshenko was right or not quite right in his definition of the subject matter of political economy. His position is the natural reaction of an expert to the alienation of the proposed "subject matter" of political economy from economic practice, the alienation of production relations from production forces. His doubts as to the definition of the subject matter of the new science merited a discussion of the question of the degree of proximity of the main economic science to economic management practice. But Stalin totally swept aside the need for such discussions.

A collective of authors headed by Academician Ostrovityanov was instructed to prepare the textbook. What an irony of fate! In 1934, in the economic debate, it was he who said: "The task is not to formulate, hundreds of times, general provisions on natural laws, but to demonstrate the operation of those laws with concrete historical material."

Now the author of those sensible words was faced with the task of refuting them, the task of compiling the "specific laws of socialism," of dissociating political economy from the other economic sciences.

Thus the "political economy of socialism," where alienation from practical work was elevated to the status of a principle, was formulated.

...Many years, decades have passed. In that time dozens of new textbooks and reference books have been written, including the latest, which came out in 1987. But the crux of the matter remains unchanged. Their genealogy derives from that same textbook, the first. The same old assertions and incantations about the "lack of hired labor," about "manpower that has automatically ceased to be a commodity." The same old "specific laws of socialism": "the plan," the "basic" law, and so forth. Laws not so much deduced from the practice of socialism, as hypothetically constructed. In that time a system

was created which grew ever stronger. It drew in more and more scientific cadres with titles and high degrees. The number of dissertations and publications based on the multiple reiteration of "who said what about such-and-such a problem" and "who thinks what" literally increased geometrically.. The more dissertations and publications appeared, the bigger the number, naturally, of people "who said such-and-such." A basis for new dissertations.

Thus political economy lost the capacity to react to real life. Its arsenal contained no mechanism to stimulate the study of the real contradictions of today's economy. Just as areas on the ground become less visible from high up, so from the observation post of the "subject" of political economy, difficulties on the ground are invisible.

If you strictly follow the letter of the "subject matter" of the political economy of socialism, any lectures in such a course are doomed to be boring and false.

The first section—on the transitional period—ends in 1937. The teachers stumble and start coughing as they approach that landmark, declaring this milestone to be a "movement toward communism," or else "the completion of the formation of socialism," or else some kind of embodiment of "real socialism."

And what about the "law of the planned approach" as one of the main laws of socialism? After all, a law is something stable in a phenomenon, something that is constantly repeated, cannot fail to be repeated.

Try looking at the "law of the planned approach" from this standpoint. Arbitrary command methods, when taken for a "planned approach," discredit the very concept of the plan as a balanced, coordinated national economic organism. Claiming that the planned approach is a "law" in the present interpretation has, it seems to me, a demoralizing effect. A careless feeling is created. If it is the "law," it will find its own path! And people forget how terribly much must be done to allow the "law of the planned approach" to exist.

Political economists represent the "plan" as a manifestation of the "law." But in practical life you constantly come up against violations of plans, failures to comply with them. At the moment, it looks as if the only stable thing about the concept of the "plan" is its violation. So the "main specific law of socialism" requires great adjustments to explain it.

Or take the question of contradictions. Without them, there can be no progress anywhere. Least of all in the economy, which is perhaps the most dynamic system of all. In the economy something is always dying away and something is being born. It is like a tree replacing its leaves. But unlike the tree, it does not automatically discard the "leaves." Contradictions arise when the new cannot arrive because the old has not departed. Try and unravel that contradiciton. But it is no use trying to do so with the help of political economy.

It is no use trying to find in a textbook at any level anything sensible about contradictions in the economy. If they are even mentioned, they are such vague, amorphous contradictions that they can cheerfully be resolved.

And then there is the interpretation of the problem of introducing new technology under socialism. Political economy textbooks simply excel at removing the contradictions from this highly important condition of the development of production forces. The authors of one textbook employ totally meaningless words which it is awkward even to quote. "Under socialism," one textbook declares, "things are different from under capitalism. 'Over there,' new technology is used when it suits the capitalist. 'Here,' those restrictions do not exist." Another textbook adds: "The socialist means of distribution of products means that both society as a whole and individual socialist enterprises have an interest in using new technology."

Another vitally important problem is the fate of the output produced. Its movement toward the consumer takes place, it may be said, blindly. (So much for the "law" of the planned approach.) How people suffer because of that blindness! But here too, everything is clear to political economy. Just listen. "Socialism removes the problem of sales as the basic problem of social production," the textbook assures us. Whatever "howevers" may follow a phrase of that kind, all the same they only represent a cosmetic reworking of those words, which carry the main sense.

For a long time there was silence at lectures on the political economy of socialism. Dead silence. But today the students are becoming livelier. And without asking, they bring reality into the auditorium: "What about prices?", "Why are inventions and discoveries not introduced?", "Why the waiting lines, shortages, surpluses, masses of unsold products?" Why? Why? Why?

Inexperienced teachers take refuge from this hail of questions in the dark recesses of the faculty, refuse to deliver lectures, and beg to be allowed to substitute "a lecture on capitalism for a lecture on socialism."

Only the textbooks are still failing to react to anything. The whole of life passes them by. It is well known that winds and storms are frightening only to living creatures.

But I was wrong to write that nothing has happened since 1954. Something did happen. The country's chief economists, political economists, jealously preserved the borders of their science that Stalin sketched out. But in a

strange, unnatural way. Usually, borders are a protection against incursions. Here, on the contrary, the concern is to prevent anyone from stepping outside the framework sketched out.

They became so good at interpreting "production relations" that even that first textbook, Stalin's, began to be regarded by the patriarchs as too free in defining the borders. The title of one section of the old textbook, "The Socialist System of National Economy," became a subject for debate among political economists. Once again, in the word "economy" they perceived a resemblance to "economic activity." They threw out the title and got rid of that word that was inappropriate to the "subject matter."

All the time I want to ask: "Esteemed colleagues, why have you wrapped yourselves in that very thin skin that you call 'production relations'? A skin torn from the living flesh of production forces? Unite the skin to the body to which it rightly belongs."

When I was preparing this article, I noticed a photograph in the newspapers: A huge yogi is cramming himself into a little transparent cube. It is a miracle how he shrinks to fit in. And again an association. Again a question to the economists: "Are you not as cramped as that yogi? Or is there no sense of space in conditions of weightlessness?"

Political economy is a science about laws. But there is a certain law. Although it explains movement in nature, it is no bad thing for society to remember it. The law of gravitation.

They say that when cosmonauts come back, their feet hurt, having grown unaccustomed to the ground in their long weightlessness. The only cure is the ground. The same is true of political economy. Having been weightless for so long, it can only be cured by contact with the ground.

Let me end with words of hope. The program for a new course in political economy was published recently. In it one can see the desire to escape the established stereotypes and abstract theoretical constructs. An important, long-awaited step. But I have observed from the economists of my acquaintance how hard it is to give up old ideas. They are astonished at the abrupt change of emphasis, they dig around in the fragments of the old ideas, trying to drag out the buried topics and ideas that used to seem fundamental. I think much work is needed to grasp the deliberate nature of the new assessments and principles.

Agricultural

Farmers Plan To Boost Protein-Rich Crops

PM1005090188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Ye. Grigoryev report under the general rubric "Harvest-88: What Is Behind the Lines of the Latest Progress Report" and the general heading "The Protein Content of the Hectare"]

[Text] The attention that is being paid to increasing the yield from protein-rich crops is not fortuitous. Anyone who is familiar with the problems of livestock raising is familiar with the consequences of a protein deficit. Insufficient quantities of protein in livestock rations lead to the overconsumption of tens of millions of tonnes of grain and other feeds. Such a situation cannot be described as normal. To rectify this, the "Protein" program has been adopted and is being implemented in the country. It is planned to increase the production of vegetable protein to 52.7 million tonnes by 1990. This is no easy task. Last year, for instance, the harvest contained only 44.4 million tonnes of protein. This year a 5-percent increase is to be added. How can this be achieved?

A. Sabirov, a link leader on Bukhara Oblast's Kolkhoz named for Kalinin believes more alfalfa should be grown. He bases his claim on the yields which he has achieved—up to 200 quintals of hay per hectare. Link leaders V. Nering and V. Adim from Taldy-Kurgan Oblast's Kolkhoz named for Krupskaya are all for soybeans. Since they grow 34-38 quintals of soybeans per hectare, they rightly regard it as the crop which opens the door to the protein reserves.

Every region, every farm has its own tactics. However, the strategic line is the same for everyone—sowing as many pulses and oil-bearing crops as possible and increasing their yields. This is precisely what agricultural workers are doing during the current sowing season. They are planning to considerably increase the protein harvest thanks to pulses, soybeans, perennial grasses, and corn grown under irrigation. Many farms give preference to the cultivation of rape. Much has been said and written about this crop. An all-union scientific-and-practical conference was recently devoted to it. The interest in rape is no accident, of course. Without rape, Tatar farms, for instance, could hardly have obtained R28 million worth of additional milk last year. This crop is also irreplaceable as green dressing in late fall and early spring.

Aware of the great potential of this crop, farmers in Belorussia, Stavropol Kray, and Omsk, Ivano-Frankovsk, and other oblasts are using rape to successfully increase livestock units' protein stocks. People in other regions are also actively tackling the cultivation of rape. This can be deduced, among other things, from the terse lines of statistical reports. Rape sowings for seed alone are being increased from 407,000 hectares last year to 693,000 hectares this year.

However, the introduction of this crop is proceeding slowly in the Ukraine, in Kazakhstan, the Baltic republics, and a number of oblasts in the RSFSR. A perfunctory attitude is sometimes still adopted to the cultivation of rape and workers are hardly ever to be seen in the fields. Hence also the low yields. In Smolensk, Vladimir, and a number of other oblasts seed yields are low. Even

in the country as a whole average yields last year totaled only 7 quintals per hectare, although there are farms were 5-6 times higher yields are being achieved.

Naturally, it is hard to break out of the protein impasse by means of partial measures. Therefore, increasing attention is being paid to the cultivation of feed crops by means of progressive techniques, the use of rational feed procurement methods, and the cultivation of high-protein-herbaceous mixtures. There is only one aim here—increasing the protein content of feeds and improving their quality.

Further April Spring Sowing Data Noted

PM0905142188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[USSR State Committee for Statistics untitled sowing progress report under the general rubric "Harvest-88: What Is Behind the Lines of the Latest Progress Report" and the general heading "The Protein Content of the Hectare"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics Reports [subhead]

By the beginning of May spring crops occupied 42.1 million hectares on kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Grain and pulses (excluding corn) occupied 20.6 million hectares, sugar beets occupied 2.8 million hectares, and vegetables occupied 606,000 hectares. Sowing of corn, rice, industrial, and other crops and planting of potatoes is in progress. Tending of cotton plantations is getting under way.

Meadows and pastures are turning green. Perennial grasses are growing well. By 2 May annual grasses had been sown on 3.7 million hectares. Farmers are paying special attention to enlarging the areas and increasing the harvest of high-protein crops.

Military

Victory Day Brings Officials' Memories, Thoughts

Kurkotkin Interview

PM1005144588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister, by S. Taranov: "With a Marshal's Baton in his Soldier's Knapsack", date and place not given—first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Much has been said about the war. It would perhaps be too much for just one man to read all the books or see all the movies. Facts, names, and events which hitherto were either concealed or distorted are gradually coming to light. But how is the complex kaleidoscope of the past to be assessed? What moral stance is to be taken so that the diversity of opinions does not overshadow the main and incontrovertible truth of the Great Patriotic War—the feat performed by the Soviet people?

Historians, politicians, and philosophers must have their say here, but this is primarily up to the frontline soldiers themselves. Just before Victory Day, an IZVESTIYA correspondent met one of them—S. Kurkotkin, now Marshal of the Soviet Union and USSR deputy defense minister.

[Taranov] Semen Konstantinovich, in just 4 years you advanced from tank commander to brigade commander, fought near Leningrad and Voronezh and in the battle for Berlin, and took part in the liberation of Prague. Subsequently, however, you have not written any memoirs. Why?

[Kurkotkin] There is no end to reminiscences about the war. But reminiscing in the family circle or among friends is one thing, and submitting your thoughts to be judged by hundreds of thousands of readers is something completely different. Here one needs extreme accuracy and, simultaneously, confidence in one's correctness and ability to tell the truth and nothing but the truth. Without any personal insults, ambitions, or self-praise... In my view, only Georgiy Konstantinovich Zhukov succeeded in fully meeting these demands—he wrote a truthful history of the war and objectively depicted the feat performed by the people and the Army.

[Taranov] What is it that you dislike in reflections on the war?

[Kurkotkin] I dislike more than anything else the depiction of the generation of the thirties and forties as some sort of robots. As if we went to war under the lash, through fear of repressions, and defended not the motherland but Stalin. Or this expression: We supposedly had "limited spiritual requirements..."

No, nobody pushed young people in the thirties into military schools—they went of their own accord, following the call of their hearts. Schoolboys were not driven to the front, whole grades of them reported to the military commissariats!... Even during the grimmest months of the war (judging by myself and my frontline comrades) there were no doubts about victory. So, judge for yourself what this was—"limited requirements" or its opposite, spiritual strength?...

In my view, the people's conscious patriotism is a historical truism. It is intolerable to doubt it or in any way to "revise" it.

[Taranov] Doubts and a certain reassessment of values are inevitable in the process of the new interpretation of history...

[Kurkotkin] Of course. As the time separating us from the Great Patriotic War increases, as with any major historical event, new views and assessments emerge. The problem is "how to look." Will we be the judges of our own history and single out isolated mistakes and crimes from its turbulent stream, or will we be its attentive students? Yes, students, but students who are aware of the causes of various ills and will never repeat them.

[Taranov] What aspects of prewar history have you personally had to reinterpret with the passage of time?

[Kurkotkin] I joined the Orel Tank School in 1937. Let us cast our minds back: That was the year when three of the five marshals were shot, and about one-half of regimental commanders, almost all brigade, division, and corps commanders, all military district commanders, members of district military councils and chiefs of military district political directorates, and many lecturers at higher and secondary military education establishments suffered...

But we students at the age of 20, just like Soviet people in their millions, could not imagine the scale of the repressions. We learned some things from newspapers, others from rumors. But few had doubts about the richly deserved punishment of "enemies of the people" and "fascist spies." It appeared normal that former commanders would be replaced by new ones, the heroes of the battles of Halhaiin Gol and Spain.

It was only decades later, after I had personally risen from lieutenant to marshal, that I became clearly aware of what it meant for "Spanish" Battalion Commander Pavlov to take over the duties of commander of the Belorussian Military District—you need a completely different level of thinking, you need completely different experience! (As a matter of fact, I do not in the least justify Pavlov's execution, which has been the subject of considerable arguments for a long time now.) In general, the Army was decapitated at the start of the most difficult war in human history...

[Taranov] But surely this must have been sensed at the start of combat operations? Officers probably discussed the causes of failures in private conversations?

[Kurkotkin] The defeats were not linked to the repressions. When you heard the scant Sovinformburo communiques, couched in general terms, you could only guess at the real causes.

Yes, there was a great shortage of information. I recall our unit's transfer from the Lake Baykal region to Vologda in the summer of 1941. We spent a few days there, then we were on our way to Volkhov. Another waiting period. On the road again later. Where to? Nobody knew. A comrade woke me up one evening: Isn't this Mytishchi we are passing through? Indeed, it was Mytishchi! But just a few days later we were back at the Leningrad Front... Later on I realized that the unexpected moves were attributable to changing circumstances: If the defense of Leningrad "collapsed" we were driven there; if there was a threatening breakthrough to Moscow we were brought near the capital. Generally speaking, the situation was getting outside the supreme command's control, but there was not much opportunity to ponder this. The war left neither time nor energy for deliberations on "general topics." Once an order had been issued it had to be executed.

[Taranov] How? How often could a commander apply his creative abilities or improvise?

[Kurkotkin] The orders laid down the task and the timetable for execution, but you yourself had to think out the ways to execute them. It was simply impossible to await prompts or to coordinate every step.

In 1942, for example, near Voronezh, we decided at battalion level to check whether the Germans were monitoring our communications. We issued a false order to attack over the tank radios and we saw the enemy guns and tanks moving into position...I know of thousands similar cases. The war revealed to the full people's abilities, their sharpness, their independence.

[Taranov] What happened if "experiments" failed? Did the culprits run the risk of facing a tribunal?

[Kurkotkin] By no means always. Common sense nevertheless prevailed, and evil intentions and "wrecking" were no longer detected in the tiniest of mistakes. Even serious errors were forgiven at times. On one occasion a brigade commander whom I knew drove his tanks into a swamp. Can you imagine the fate that would have befallen him before the war? But General Chernyakhovskiy's order was: Get them all out by morning!... On the next day these "drowned" tanks and their commander captured Shepetovka.

[Taranov] It is said that the war made people more crude, more hard, more pitiless...

[Kurkotkin] A war is certainly no picnic. When you are sending someone to his death and you are marching next to him, there is no time for cordial niceties. You cannot have a commander saying: Now look here, dear boy, could you please get up that hill and get the fascists off it, but do bear in mind that you might get killed in the process...

Extreme conditions demanded hardness. But they did not demand either crudeness or cruelty. After all, it was simply impossible to survive without mutual assistance, without the knowledge that a comrade's help was at hand. And without the mercy and sensitivity which were then displayed a hundredfold more than now.

There was a meeting of frontline physicians some 15 years ago. They spent many hours discussing what "peacetime" medicine had lost when compared with "wartime" medicine. These losses fall within moral categories.

The same things has happened in the army. While at the front, the commander was the last one to eat from the common pot. If for no other reason than because the soldiers carried their spoons tucked inside the tops of their boots, while my "brigade commander's" spoon was inside the tank, wrapped up in cloth...

[Taranov] Here is one of disputed questions about the war: To what extent are the enemy's image, his strength, and his organization correctly depicted?

[Kurkotkin] Yes, a satirical style predominated for a long time here, something like the bravado of victors who utterly crushed the fascist armies. But the war actually lasted 4 years! And the opponent was perfectly well supplied and experienced. The Germans were not joking: The slightest mistake or failure inevitably had to be paid for.

But it is equally incorrect to contrast the Germans' discipline and pedantry with the Russians' "sloppiness," or to strive to present the fascists as heroes without fear and without doubts. After all, the war ended in Berlin, not in Moscow! I recall quite a few occasions when the celebrated conquerors of Europe gave in to difficulties even in 1941, which was a successful year for them. In the fall of 1941 our unit was attacked by three enemy bombers. My friend, a lieutenant, did not panic and opened fire at them with an ordinary flare pistol. And what did the Luftwaffe aces do? They turned away and dropped their bombs in the swamp!

[Taranov] And how about aid from the allies? Did you feel its effect in your battalion, in your brigade?

[Kurkotkin] I came across British tanks in other units. They were inferior to the Soviet tanks. American motor vehicles were excellent at that time. On holidays our gruel and cabbage soup were supplemented by stew from across the ocean... In short, the allies' aid helped to fill some of our gaps.

To be truthful, I would not like to draw any biased conclusions on the basis of just my personal impressions. This is another question waiting for historians to dot all the "i's." Writers are also arguing about it. Chingiz Aytmatov, for example, wrote in IZVESTIYA and called for the allied aid given by the United States and Britain to be placed in "the appropriate position of gratitude." Well, serious study of the problem and of "declassified" statistical data, without overlooking anything, ought to prove whether he is right or not.

[Taranov] Were people at the front aware of the brutalities committed by fascists in the occupied territories, of the privations suffered by Soviet people in the rear?

[Kurkotkin] Take the famine in Leningrad for example—we guessed rather than knew about it. We sensed that our families in the rear did not have an easy time of it. True, it was not the done thing to describe your plight in letters to the front—we tried to spare each other from "unnecessary" details. We realized: Tears would not alleviate the sorrow, everybody had a hard time, and there was no chance for any particular revelations in view of the censorship restrictions on correspondence.

But what we saw in the liberated territories really made us furious. I will always remember a village near Voronezh: A row of gallows and beneath them, arranged with German precision, were the bodies of old people, children, women. You wanted to scream at the retreating fascists: Why on earth did you kill them? Fight against us!...

[Taranov] Did that have any effect when the Soviet Army entered Germany?

[Kurkotkin] Russian people don't bear grudges. For example, on the march from Berlin to Prague in May 1945 we received an order: Germans were not to be fired on unless they offered resistance. And we did not open fire, even though we were dealing with soldiers. The attitude toward the civilian population was even more humanitarian, with the exception of isolated and extremely rare occasions. After the war, while I was commander in chief of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany, I never heard any reports of implied or direct insults against GDR citizens. On the other hand, Western movies frequently depict the Russian soldier in Berlin as a murderer, a rapist, a marauder... No, we did not "take a stroll" across Europe, we liberated it from fascism at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives. This truth must be known to everyone.

[Taranov] And a rather delicate question—about awards. How fair was the procedure for the award of orders and medals during the war?

[Kurkotkin] I cannot recall anything like the episode shown in the movie "Burning Snow" [Goryachiy Sneg], when the commander picked orders from a large bag and pinned them on people's chests. As a rule, documents recommending an award had to bear numerous and quite "high-ranking" signatures. On the whole, this procedure was fair. But let us think about it, is it altogether possible to make a categorical judgment here, to say "yes" or "no"?

During the liberation of Krakow, two of my companies captured the airfield, after which one commander received the Order of the Red Banner while the other was made Hero of the Soviet Union. Was that fair?...

Or a typical textbook example. The famous "Pavlov House" in Stalingrad is named after a sergeant rather than after the lieutenant who commanded his actions. This is probably how people's memory and history judged. What can you do, should we rewrite it all, should we "cancel" the established name? In my view, there is and there can be no "yardstick or standard weight" of heroism. Victory in the Great Patriotic War was the best award for frontline soldiers.

[Taranov] Do you often recall the war, Semen Konstantinovich?

[Kurkotkin] In detail, hardly ever. There was much hardship, much suffering... But on 9 May, without fail. When the whole family gets together, when the children and grandchildren arrive... I think of the war when I hear of the death of frontline comrades. Few of my comrades-in-arms are left.

[Taranov] What would you wish to IZVESTIYA's readers on Victory Day?

[Kurkotkin] Peace, happiness, and prosperity, of course... And something else: That each and every one of us Soviet people should be a patriot of his motherland. Don't let someone's selfish current interests overshadow even in the slightest the tasks of the state and of the whole people. The unity of the people, rallied in defense of their country and of socialism, was decisive in the victory over fascism. We also need it now, in the hard work on restructuring.

Tretyak on Losses, Gains

LD0905150688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0445 GMT 9 May 88

[Studio address by Army General Ivan Moiseyevich Tretyak, USSR deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces—live or recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades: 43 years ago, during the first few days of May 1945, the final salvoes of the most cruel war in human history died away. The long and heavy struggle against Hitlerite Germany and its allies was crowned with a great victory, and the decisive contribution to the crushing defeat of fascism was made by the Soviet Union and its valiant Armed Forces. The years disappear into the past and fewer and fewer veterans of the war remain within our ranks. But memory is not transferred into the reserve and the lessons of those distant battles do not fade. From the vantage point of the decades during which we have lived under a peaceful sky we see vividly the unforgettable feat of the multinational Soviet people who defended the honor, freedom, and independence of the socialist homeland and rid the planet of the brown plague of Nazism. We of the front line see this with particular clarity.

The chronicle of the Great Patriotic War contains many illustrious pages. It contains battles that are mighty in their scale; the mass heroism of Soviet fighters; the matchless courage of the partisans and those operating underground; and the selflessness of those laboring in the rear. Our victory was a deeply natural event. Historically it was achieved by the advantages of the socialist social and state system. At the festivities marking the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee, remarked that the war showed that the Soviet people, the party, socialism, and the October Revolution are inseparable, and that there are no forces in the world capable of smashing that unity.

The Soviet people paid a dear price to defend the gains of the Great October Revolution first and foremost 20 million lives irrevocably lost and the loss of nearly 30 percent of its national wealth. But for this price a precious gain was acquired, peace for us, for our children and grandchildren. Man's grateful memory continues today to return again and again to those bleak years when the coming victory was forged.

During the war socialism proved convincingly its economic and political durability, its moral and political superiority over the enemy, and its unshakable ideological maturity. High levels of combat might and military art were demonstrated by the Soviet Armed Forces, together with whom partisan detachments, formations of irregulars and courageous fighters of the underground carried out active combat operations against the fascists. During 4 years of war our troops carried out 50 strategic operations, including 35 offensive operations; 506 Hitlerite divisions were destroyed or smashed, exceeding by more than three times the strength of the fascist land forces which invaded the Soviet Union. In addition 100 divisions belonging to Germany's allies were routed. The Soviet Army also destroyed the main part of the enemy's military equipment: up to 75 percent of its total losses in tanks and assault guns, more than 75 percent of its entire aircraft, and 74 percent of its aritllery systems. All of this is clear evidence of the fact that the fate of the war was decided on the Soviet-German front.

Victory inspired the Soviet people to the rapid restoration of the destroyed economy and the healing of the wounds of war. It enhanced the prestige and international authority of the Soviet Union and its influence upon the renewal of the world. The defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism during World War II created the prerequisites for the victory of socialist revolutions in a number of countires in Europe and Asia. The world system of socialism was formed. Radical changes took place in the correlation of forces on the international arena. The scale of the revolutionary process increased. Life itself has confirmed a thousand times that the results and the consequences of the Great Patriotic War have been vast in their historical significance.

The force that smashed the shock-detachments of world imperialism was nourished on sources that do not exist and that cannot exist in the world of capitalism. During the evil days of war the test for toughness was passed with honor by the ideological and the social and political unity of the party, of the people, and the Army; by the firm alliance of the workers, the peasants, and the people's intelligentsia; and by the friendship and brotherhood of all the nations and ethnic groups of the Soviet Union.

The necessary lessons have been drawn from the lessons of the Great Patriotic War. The most important of these is the greatest possible vigilance regarding the aggressive intrigues of imperialism and its military preparations. This is a lesson we must not forget. That is why even on the brightest holidays and particularly on Victory Day we always remember another date, 22 June 1941.

Forty-three years have already gone by since the end of World War II. But mankind still lives in an uneasy world, even though as 1987 turned into 1988 hopeful signs appeared of an improvement in the international situation. The new political thinking is finding its real embodiment in practical steps in lowering the threshold of the military danger. A treaty has been signed between the Soviet Union and the United States on eliminating two classes of nuclear missiles. Our peace initiatives have obtained a solution as a result of the Geneva talks on Afghanistan. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country will begin in a few days. But as long as the reactionary forces have not given up ideas of social revenge our party, with due regard for the defensive character of military doctrine, will do all that is necessary for the reliable defense of the peaceful labor of the Soviet people.

Restructuring and creative work that is revolutionary in its essence are developing ever more widely in the Soviet Union. The 27th party congress set course toward the renaissance of Leninist traditions, toward the acceleration of social and economic growth. The Central Committee February Plenum equipped the party, the people, and the servicemen of the Army and the Navy with the ideology of revolutionary renewal. The Central Committee's conclusions and decisions on fundamental problems of restructuring in the country are most directly relevant to the Armed Forces. This is well understood by our servicemen who see the rigorous fulfillment of the constitutional obligations of armed defenders of the homeland as their supreme patriotic and internationalist duty. A firm course toward restructuring, sociopolitical upsurge, a businesslike attitude based on high end results: This is precisely how one can describe the situation among the troops and in the fleets, in every Army and Navy collective, on the eve of the 19th all-union party conference.

It should be said that the lessons linked with the flight of the West German light aircraft over the territory of the Soviet Union about a year ago—complacency while on alert duty, formalism and indulgences in the combat training of the troops—have been taken into consideration in full measure in our plans and practical affairs. The requirements of the Politburo and the Central Committee in raising the combat readiness and discipline of the Armed Forces and the Air Defense Troops, in improving the control of formations and units, and in ensuring that they are constantly ready to cut short any violations of the air boundaries of the Soviet state have been placed at the foundation of the activity of the command and political personnel, of the party and Komsomol organizations, and of all service personnel. A special program which includes a set of political, organizational, and educational tasks for the intensification and restructuring of all spheres of our life and our combat activity has been worked out and is being implemented.

An atmosphere of creative activity and businesslike and responsible attitudes is being asserted in the formations, the units, and the subunits. Demands have been raised in the matter of the personal contribution to combat readiness and the performance of tasks of alert duty and combat service. More attention has begun to be paid to the implementation of social policy among the troops. Today the personnel participate activley in the socialist competition for meeting the coming party conference in a worthy manner under the slogan: Selfless military labor, exemplary service, and discipline at the highest level are our contribution to the cause of defending the homeland. It has been initiated among the services by front-ranking military collectives.

Soviet servicemen do have those whom they can emulate; they do have those whom they can take as a worthy example. Our arsenal contains the combat traditions of the fighters of the front, their heroic feats to the glory of the homeland, and also the courage and the valor of the best representatives of the postwar generations displayed during the performance of training and combat tasks and internationalist duty.

Remarkable people also serve in the Air Defense Troops. For example, the name of Hero of the Soviet Union Lieutenant Colonel Levchenko, who on Afghan soil repeated the feat of Nikolay Gastello, is well known. Another Hero of the Soviet Union, Captain Yeliseyev, for the first time in the history of jet-propelled aviation used a ramming strike to bring down a violating aircraft in a border region. Colonel Comrade Zhukov also became a Hero of the Soviet Union in peacetime. Comrades Askarov, Kulyapin, Kunitsyn, Polyakov, all officers; Junior Sergeant Mosin; and Lance Corporal (Orzhanov), and many others have been given high combat awards. We have every right to describe such people as our golden treasury.

Today, on this glorious Victory Day, we address our warmest congratulations to the veterans of the Armed Forces who took part in the Great Patriotic War and in

fulfillment of the international duty. We heartily congratulate all Soviet people, the servicemen of the Army and the Navy. We wish you happiness and good health, success in labor and service activity for the good of the socialist homeland. Greetings on the holiday, dear comrades!

Shestapolov on War Anniversary, New Proposals

LD0605100288 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 7 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS—"The peaceful foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state evokes support of the Soviet Army and Navy servicemen," Soviet Deputy Defence Minister Nikolay Shestopalov has pointed out.

The marshal of engineering troops, in an interview with a TASS correspondent on the occasion of the 43rd anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945), marked on May 9, observed that the Soviet proposals that represented a specific programme for eliminating nuclear weapons set an example of new political thinking in the current international situation.

Marshal Shestopalov said that by defeating Nazi Germany's war machine, the Soviet Armed Forces saved mankind from the threat of fascist enslavement.

The military commander recalled that states of the anti-Hitler coalition greatly contributed to defeating nazism.

"The opening of the second front in Europe, though belated, was a substantial contribution to the common struggle.

"The entire experience of the anti-Hitler coalition shows that states different by their social systems can find mutually acceptable solutions and effectively work towards the common goal," Shestopalov said.

"The military threat posed by imperialist circles compels the Soviet Union to apply efforts to maintain its defence capability at a level securing military-strategic parity in the world.

"The Soviet Armed Forces maintain constant combat readiness and strengthen military cooperation with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries."

Zaykov, Yazov Honor Unknown Soldier

LD0905122888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 9 May 88

[Excerpt] People are still flooding to Aleksandr Garden [in Moscow] to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and there is no end to to it.

Wreaths have been laid here on behalf of the Moscow Gorkom and the Moscow city and oblast soviets. Zaykov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Moscow Gorkom first secretary, took part in a ceremony of wreath laying. Formations of troops that hold the banners of the combat units and groupings that became famous in battles with fascist invaders.

Army General Yazov, stood in a straight and motionless line near the Kremlin wall. Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, was among those who came to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to honor the bright memory of those who battled for the honor, freedom and independence of our fatherland and who failed to live to see the Victory Day. [passage omitted].

Sukhorukov on World War II, GDR Role Today

LD0405193388 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—"Even in the grimmest days of the past war the Soviet people never equated Nazism with the German people," Soviet Deputy Defence Minister Dmitriy Sukhorukov said today at a meeting in Moscow marking the 43rd anniversary of the liberation of the German people from Nazism.

General of the Army Sukhorukov emphasised that "peace gained at the cost of more than 50 million human lives in the Second World War needs protection."

At a time when the USSR and other socialist countries stuck to a course towards lasting peace, aggressive imperialist circles were applying much effort to push mankind on to a road of confrontation, he noted.

"Under these conditions, political, cultural, economic and defence cooperation of the Warsaw Treaty member countries, of which the German Democratic Republic is a firm link, is becoming increasingly solid."

The deputy defence minister described as "first results" of new political thinking on questions of war and peace in the nuclear age the conclusion of the INF Treaty and the signing of the Geneva agreements on the political settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan.

These developments, in his view, should essentially alleviate the processes of detente to prevent the repetition of the horrors that happened 43 years ago but were still fresh in people's memory.

The GDR's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, Gerd Koenig, took the floor at the meeting.

Volkogonov on 'Truth' in Historical Analysis

PM1005090788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 May 88 Morning Edition p 6

[S. Taranov interview with Colonel General Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense Military History Institute, under the rubric "Names and Events": "D. Volkogonov: Truth Above All Else"; date and place not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Taranov] Millions of people's demand for the whole truth about the war and the history of the Army and Navy is still unsatisfied. Could you say what the "blanks" in this history are?

[Volkogonov] I feel that this term is not totally accurate. It is better to talk about poorly researched pages of the past, which is sometimes represented in people's minds in the form of distorted images and patterns. For various reasons scientists have failed to "leaf through" many events. The interpretation of some of these events has often been distorted under pressure of the political atmosphere of the time. Naturally, this has been accompanied by the practice of glossing over "uncomfortable" facts and "jettisoning" many people. But, you know, when ancient Rome adopted the law on "The Denunciation of Memory," which instructed people to forget anything "inconvenient," it soon became clear that the memory lives (or dies) according to its own laws....

There is a great deal our readership does not know about the prewar period and the events preceding the start of the war. It is not enough to simply enumerate the names of repressed military commanders, as is often the case now. Without a full social and political picture of that period you cannot immediately understand why the fascist armies got as far as the walls of Moscow.

There is also another problem connected with the need to show the war as a bilateral process. We often give a one-sided picture of combat operations, and the enemy with his real power and aggressive aspirations, which at times are not devoid of shrewd calculations and innovative approaches, often seems to remain off screen. After all, millions of Soviet soldiers did not die fighting windmills!

The question of the allies.... Very little has usually been said about them. But this is one of the fundamental lessons to be learned from the last war. The antifascist coalition of states with different social systems showed that it could be a prototype for the present "antinuclear" coalition—if I may express it as such—the world is waiting for....

History is not faceless, just as it is not subordinate to the actions of a few people alone. It is not simply a concept of changing times and eras. It is at the same time an infinite gallery of people. It is the moral duty of scientists to impart the real role played by the people and to reveal the true heroes—from soldier to marshal. Members of the institute are seriously studying these and other problems.

[Taranov] What are the main works to be published in the near future?

[Volkogonov] Work has begun on a 10-volume "History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People" and an 8-volume military encyclopaedia (second edition). A fundamental work on the history of the art of war and local wars is being prepared. We are publishing a major work entitled "The Causes of World War II" in conjunction with scientists from socialist countries....

[Taranov] What about popular books?

[Volkogonov] Here we have severly failed history enthusiasts and young people—far from everyone can cope with "dry" monographs.

In the future—and this has long been my dream—we need to publish an extensive "Patriotic Library" consisting of small books on the subject of the most important battles and the glory of Russian and Soviet arms—from the battle of Kulikovo and Borodino to events of recent years. Some of these books must be devoted to the personalities of military commanders, war heroes, military equipment designers, and outstanding defense organizers. But this, I repeat, is work for the future. Why? We do not have enough military historians. We have trained too few cadres in earlier years.

[Taranov] Tell me, do you have any opponents?

[Volkogonov] Yes. It is worse when we do not have any. In science the absence of discussion kills ideas, investigation, and discovery. Truth is above all else. We have discussions and cooperate closely both within the institute and with the USSR Academy of Sciences' history institutes and the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute.

[Taranov] What are your personal plans? Readers are waiting for the publication of your book on Stalin....

[Volkogonov] It will be entitled "Triumph and Tragedy" and will tell how the triumph of one man became a tragedy for an entire nation and distorted the Leninist principles of socialism, the consequences of which we can still feel today. I would describe this work as documentary, philosophical prose. I intend to complete the book this fall.

Memorial Plaque Commemorates Army Gen Yepishev
PM0905095588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report "In Memory of A.A. Yepishev"]

[Text] On 3 May a memorial plaque devoted to Hero of the Soviet Union Army General Aleksey Alekseyevich Yepishev was unveiled on the building of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. The prominent Soviet party and military figure worked in this building from 1962 to 1985.

The memorial plague with a bas-relief portrait of A.A. Yepishev was produced to a design by sculptor I.M. Rukavishnikov, RSFSR People's Artist and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Arts, and architect A.A. Skokan.